Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-061 30 March 1988

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

International Space Weapons Inspection Proposed 1
Kampelman, Nitze on INF Ratification 1
SS-20 Allegation Intended 'To Hinder' Treaty 1
Film on INF Treaty's 'Hour of Truth' Premiered 1
Solton: Poor Memory Blinds West to Arms Balance 2
'Commonsense' ABM Treaty Interpretation Urged *[TRUD 23 Mar]* 2
Scientist Calls SDI Components 'Impracticable' *[IZVESTIYA 22 Mar]* 4
Anniversary of 'Adventurist' SDI Program Noted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Mar]* 6

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gerasimov Gives Press Briefing 29 Mar 8
Condemns Use of Gas in Gulf 8
Welcomes Nicaraguan Agreement 8
Reagan Aide, Senators in Moscow 8
Denies Advisers Killed 8
Summit Arms Agreement Possible 9
Nagorno-Karabakh Not Normal Yet 9
Kashlev Assesses Vienna CSCE Negotiations 10
Third Basket 'Most Complicated' 10
'Hopes of Success' *[Tosunyan in IZVESTIYA 30 Mar]* 10
Drobkov Reviews Arms Talks, Central America *[PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 11

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Two Tomahawk Missiles Tested in Gulf of Mexico 14
Arbatov on 'Restructuring' Facing U.S. 14
Soviet-U.S. Oncologists in Teleconference 14
Gorbachev Greets Participants 15
Journalist Examines U.S.-Published GLASNOST *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 23 Mar]* 15

China

Wu Xueqian Encouraged by Detente Trend *[IZVESTIYA 21 Mar]* 18
TASS Reports Chinese Air Force Upgrade 18
Alekseyev Discusses 'Objective Need' for Summit 18

Northeast Asia

KCNA Reports SR-71 Violates DPRK Airspace 18
South Korean Navy Violates DPRK Waters 19
'Team Spirit' Maneuvers Raise Tensions in Korea *[Solovyev]* 19
Concern Voiced at Japanese Military Programs *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Mar]* 19

Near East & South Asia

Chemical Troops Chief Pikalov Visits Syria 20
Meets With General *[Damascus SANA]* 20
Sees Army Commander *[Damascus]* 21
Amman Islamic Conference Proceedings Reported *[Skosyrev in IZVESTIYA 26 Mar]* 21

Afghan Rebel Groups Receive New Missiles *[Knyazkov]* 22
Profile of Afghan Rebel Leader Cited *[IZVESTIYA 29 Mar]* 22
Najibullah Election Appeal to Afghan People 23
Afghan Left-Wing Alliance Publishes Platform *[IZVESTIYA 28 Mar]* 23
Artifical Border Issue Raised at Geneva Talks *[IZVESTIYA 26 Mar]* 24
Petrovskiy Attends Bangladesh Reception 24

East Europe

Jakes Notes CPCZ Leading Restructuring *[PRAVDA 28 Mar]* 25
BCP Decision on Reporting of Corruption *[PRAVDA 23 Mar]* 25
Demichev Awards Bulgarian Embassy Official 26
Jaruzelski Receives Academician Arbatov 26
Poland's Malinowski on 'Vital Period of Change' *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 20 Mar]* 26
PZPR Delegation Visits USSR 21-25 March *[PRAVDA 26 Mar]* 28
PZPR Visitors Study Party Leadership of Media *[PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 28
MSZMP Plenum Report Describes Discussions *[PRAVDA 26 Mar]* 28
Hungarian Writer on Renewal of Socialism *[PRAVDA 26 Mar]* 29
Tisch-Led Union Delegation Meets AUCCTU
[East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND 19-20 Mar] 30
Unions Conclude Talks *[ADN]* 30
Talks Detailed *[TRUD 22 Mar]* 31
Silayev, SFRY's Zemljaric Sign Program *[PRAVDA 25 Mar]* 32

West Europe

Gorbachev, PCI's Natta Discuss Europe, Ties 32
Delegation Members Participate 32
Natta Interviewed on Talks 33
Further on Discussions 33
TASS Issues Correction 35
Comparison of Report on Talks 35
Natta Gives News Conference 36
Further on Remarks 36
Gromyko Presents Award 37
Gromyko Praises Natta 37
Natta Seen off by Dobrynin 37
Thatcher Government Disarmament Stand Criticized *[PRAVDA 29 Mar]* 37
France Urged To End South Pacific Nuclear Tests *[Bogachev]]* 39
Mitterrand on Disarmament, French Elections *[PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 40
Gerasimov Denies Knowledge of Spies in FRG *[DPA]* 40
Journalist Charts Improved Soviet-FRG Ties *[Yakhontov in PRAVDA 26 Mar]* 40
FRG Trade Union Delegation Discusses Links *[TRUD 29 Mar]* 42
Gorbachev Book Published in FRG 43
Shevchenko Assesses Visit to Nordic Countries *[IZVESTIYA 27 Mar]* 43
Greek Foreign Minister Views Regional Issues *[IZVESTIYA 26 Mar]* 44
Cypriot Communist Party Leader Retires *[Potapov in PRAVDA 25 Mar]* 45

Latin America & Caribbean

Ortega Accuses U.S. of Hindering Settlement 45
Panama Complains of U.S. Actions to UN 45
UK Falklands Exercises Seen as 'Provocative' *[PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 45
Interview With Chilean Rebel Group Cited 46

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Further on Armenia, Azerbaijan Situation 49
Socioeconomic Plans Described *[TRUD 25 Mar]* 49
Azerbaijan Prepares for Subbotnik 50
Plants Idle; 'Krunk' Scored *[IZVESTIYA 30 Mar]* 50
Investigation 'Hampered by Rumors' *[IZVESTIYA 30 Mar]* 51
'Comprehensive and Massive Plan' *[Yerevan]* 51
'Indefinite Strike' Continues *[AFP]* 52
Mood in Stepanakert 'Normal' *[PRAVDA 30 Mar]* 52
Azerbaijanis Returning to Armenia *[PRAVDA 30 Mar]* 53
Armenians Returning to Sumgait *[PRAVDA 30 Mar]* 53
Sumgait Gorispolkom Chief Replaced *[Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 17 Mar]* 54
Sumgait Gorkom Chief Replaced *[Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 17 Mar]* 54
Azerbaijan Leadership Condolences *[Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 5 Mar]* 54
Final Part of Analysis of NKAO Events, Lessons *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 54
'Subversive' Western Role in NKAO Events *[Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 8 Mar]* 58
Latvian CP Official Views Nationality Issues *[London MORNING STAR 24 Mar]* 60
Officials Explain Foreign Travel Regulations *[IZVESTIYA 20 Mar]* 62
Revival of Lenin's Control Commission Urged *[PRAVDA 18 Mar]* 63
Yevtushenko on High-Level Opposition to Glasnost 65
Muscovites Polled on Meaning of 'Good Life' 65
Rehabilitated Leaders' Lives To Be Published *[TRUD 19 Mar]* 66
Contents of KOMMUNIST No 5 Reported *[PRAVDA 28 Mar]* 66

Economic

Resolution Adopted on Retooling Light Industry 66
Uralmash Rejection of 1988 Plan Examined *[IZVESTIYA 23 Mar]* 67
Gosbank Working Group Studies Currency Problems
[EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No 12] 71

Agricultural

Murakhovskiy: Farmers 'Congress of Restructuring' *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 26 Mar]* 71

Military

Shcherbitskiy, Others Discuss Military Training *[IZVESTIYA 30 Mar]* 74
'Many Unresolved Problems' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Mar]* 75
Yazov Order on Reserves, April-June Draft *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Mar]* 75

International Space Weapons Inspection Proposed
LD291922 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 29 Mar 88

[Text] The Soviet Union has proposed to set up an international inspection to prevent the deployment of weapons in outer space. The Soviet Foreign Ministry reports that a reply from the United States to the Soviet letter handed over in Geneva has so far not been received.

The new Soviet initiative envisages the deployment of international inspections with extensive powers at all the launching grounds and tests sites which can be used for space launchings. On suspicion that the launch may be used for orbiting weapons, inspectors should examine the launcher, the cargo, and even the storages.

Kampelman, Nitze on INF Ratification
LD301248 Moscow TASS in English 1244 GMT 30 Mar 88

[Text] Washington March 30 TASS—Max Kampelman, the head of the U.S. delegation at the talks with the USSR in Geneva, expressed the view that the U.S. Senate would give a go-ahead to the ratification of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

His opinion, as Max Kampelman pointed out at the hearings at the House Foreign Affairs Committee on Tuesday, is based on the assumption that the treaty has the "support of an overwhelming majority of senators." In proof of that he noted that the Senate Committee on Armed Services had recommended the endorsement of the treaty by 18 votes against two. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is likely to approve it on Wednesday by a similar majority vote. As he pointed out, as far as he can remember the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence unanimously recommended that the treaty be ratified. Thus, in his opinion, things are going smoothly.

Addressing the same hearings on arms control, Paul Nitze, special adviser to the President and the U.S. secretary of state on arms control matters, refuted the claims by a number of figures in the USA that the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles in Europe necessitated a modernisation of NATO's conventional forces. Paul Nitze declared that, in his view, when the INF Treaty is implemented this will improve the overall military balance between the Warsaw Treaty and the West. Therefore, as he said, he did not think there was a growing need for a modernisation of the conventional forces.

Answering questions from congressmen, Max Kampelman said that he believed that it was possible to complete the drafting of the treaty on a 50-per cent cut in the strategic offensive weapons of the USA and the USSR before the summit meeting in Moscow. This is possible, albeit it is going to be difficult, the head of the U.S. delegation emphasized.

SS-20 Allegation Intended 'To Hinder' Treaty
LD301047 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0955 GMT 30 Mar 88

[Text] Moscow, 30 Mar (TASS)—"Now, at a time when most U.S.legislators have virtually expressed a vote of confidence in the Soviet-U.S. treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles by coming out in favor of its ratification, one cannot but be surprised by some of those in congress who oppose it" said General Geliy Batenin, military expert at the CPSU Central Committee, in an interview with a TASS diplomatic correspondent today. "In particular the point is that a closed plenary meeting of the U.S. Senate has discussed certain intelligence data according to which the Soviet side has allegedly tried to conceal a certain number of SS-20 missiles."

"The impression is being created that the story of the allegedly hidden SS-20 missiles, which bears no relation to reality, is intended not only to hinder ratification of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles but also in general to create an obstacle along the path of further nuclear missile disarmament," Gen Batenin continued. "This attempt looks particularly inept if one bears in mind the profound verification [kontrol] measures which lie at the core of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. It is regrettable that such actions by the opponents of the treaty hinder the normal course of the process of nuclear missile disarmament with which the world public links its hopes."

Film on INF Treaty's 'Hour of Truth' Premiered
LD282206 Moscow TASS in English 1947 GMT 28 Mar 88

[Text] Moscow March 28 TASS—The authors of the documentary film "The Treaty", which was premiered at the Press Centre of the USSR Foreign Ministry today, describe the Soviet-American December summit meeting in Washington as "a long expected hour of truth".

This is the film on the daring and large-scale decisions of the leadership of the USSR and the USA which led to the signing of the unprecedented treaty on the elimination of the intermediate- and shorter-range nuclear missiles. The two sides realised that not only force should be trusted. Trust is also a force today. One should learn to conduct with the opposite side a dialogue on a par and jointly to aspire for the future acceptable to all, it is underlined in the film.

Another important topic of the film is the significance of "people's diplomacy". Without "people's diplomacy", without the huge development of the anti-nuclear movement in Europe, America, everywhere in the world, the authors believe, there would have been no great advancement in official diplomacy. It is exactly people, participating in the peace movement, without claiming any laurels, that were genuine authors of the "missile zero" idea, which has found its way to the world of big politics. The simple truth of our times is that without people questions of war and peace cannot be resolved now.

The very fact of the signing of the INF Treaty is directly linked with the process of perestroyka and public openness in our country, with the new thinking ideas which exerted influence on the foreign policy decisions of the Soviet leadership, said journalist Aleksandr Pumpyanskiy, who wrote the scenario for the film "Treaty" directed by Leonid Makhnatch. The treaty was unthinkable as far as five years ago, he told TASS correspondent Sergey Zanin.

The word "treaty" has two meanings in Russian: an international legal agreement, and an understanding, questing and the ultimate accord. This is our stand, as the authors: We are in favour of looking for accords between the USSR and USA, beteween East and West, for consent between them, said Aleksandr Pumpyanskiy.

Solton: Poor Memory Blinds West to Arms Balance
LD281814 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 28 Mar 88

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Text] As the prospects have been growing ever more feasible for the ratification of the treaty scrapping 2,500 Soviet and American nuclear missiles the most outrageous opposition groups have become even more hysterical. They have been painting the situation in dark colors and threatening Western Europe with the possibility that it may be left defenseless against Soviet tanks. One may only marvel at the way they've been juggling figures in a bid to prove the Warsaw Treaty's multiple advantage over NATO in terms of conventional arms, and outsiders may indeed become anxious about the situation.

Meanwhile, a closer look at assertions of this kind will reveal strange gaps in the memory of their authors. While harping on what they call arms surpluses in other countries they forget to mention the scale of their own, that is NATO, arsenals. Specifically, there is a lot of talk about the Warsaw Treaty's advantage in tanks, but no mention is made of NATO's multiple advantage in antitank weapons or of the fact that NATO has, by 1,500, more tactical aircraft, which too can be used in combatting tanks. Obviously this is due to poor memory.

Another claim is the Warsaw Treaty has too many troops in central Europe. Meanwhile, the fact that NATO enjoys a considerable advantage at the northern and southern flanks is hushed up. This is another case of memory failure. While vigorous debates are going around the number of army personnel NATO's advantage in terms of naval and air force personnel is being pushed into the background. No account is taken of the opinion of many prominent military experts, including those in the West, that despite the natural asymmetries there is an approximate balance of both nuclear and conventional weapons in Europe.

The statistics made public by Soviet military experts are described as propaganda, so where is the way out? How can one possibly establish the truth? The Soviet Union's suggestion is simple: To lay down the cards and launch negotiations, and here is a concrete program. In the middle of April experts could start coordinating data liable to publication. In the middle of May they could openly exchange information about their conventional armed forces and armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Ural mountains. Later this year they could start negotiating cuts in removing imbalances.

And what's been the West's reaction to this suggestion? The Soviet foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, who officially advanced this program in Washington, says diplomatically the United States failed to show any special enthusiasm about it. Other NATO nations too have been keeping silent. So who is interested in the truth after all? Why is it in showing such great anxiety about the balance of forces in Europe NATO officials are so afraid of openness? Obviously because they are afraid of being caught red-handed at falsifying things.

'Commonsense' ABM Treaty Interpretation Urged
PM251607 Moscow TRUD in Russian 23 Mar 88 p 3

[Candidate of Technical Sciences Colonel V. Chernyshev article under the "Readers Ask" rubric: "What Is the Significance of the ABM Treaty?"]

[Text] By signing the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles in Washington, the USSR and U.S. leaders demonstrated that the elimination of the most modern nuclear missiles is a really feasible matter. It was decided not to allow a lengthy pause before examining the question of a radical reduction in the most threatening types of these weapons—the strategic offensive armaments. The delegations at the Geneva talks were charged with endeavoring to complete the drawing up of a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive armaments in the shortest possible time, so that it could be signed during the next Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow in the first half of 1988.

Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, leader of the Soviet working group of experts which functioned during the Washington meeting, said that the talks on the linkage between the future strategic offensive arms treaty

and the existing ABM Treaty were particularly complex. The struggle hinged on the requisite interpretation of the latter. U.S. experts proposed severing or at least weakening the aforementioned linkage. But the Soviet delegation wanted the following inserted in the joint statement: "With a view to preparing a treaty on strategic offensive arms, the leaders of the two countries have also charged their delegations in Geneva with elaborating an accord which would oblige the sides to observe the ABM Treaty as signed in 1972 when carrying out research, development, and, where necessary, tests which are permitted under the ABM Treaty and not to revoke the ABM Treaty for an agreed period."

It would seem that the task had been clearly defined. However, the actual state of things in Geneva prompts caution. Certain recent statements by the U.S. leadership, in particular by U.S. President R. Reagan in Washington at the conference on the topic "SDI: The First 5 Years," have added an additional element of uncertainty. He complained that "certain figures in the Congress would like to tie us to an artificially restricted interpretation of the ABM Treaty, which would effectively prevent the development and implementation of our SDI program." It follows from this that the interpretation of the treaty as signed in 1972 once again does not suit the U.S. Administration.

What "interpretation" of the ABM Treaty does it want? For almost 15 years both the Soviet and the U.S. sides had an identical understanding of this treaty. This document especially stipulates that the creation, testing, and deployment of sea-, space-, or mobile surface-launched ABM systems or components are forbidden. In other words the ABM Treaty bans the creation of any ABM systems that are not ground-based. These systems can only be located in certain regions. In 1974 the USSR and the United States signed a protocol to the treaty, under which the number of regions where each side could site ABM systems was reduced to one: The USSR chose the Moscow region while the United States chose the region of the Grand Forks Missile Base.

Moreover, Article 3 of the treaty restricts the ABM systems in even the one area to within precisely defined limits: A radius of no more than 150 km, with no more than 100 ABM launch installations, and no more than 100 actual antiballistic missiles.

At the same time the treaty permits research to be carried out and systems and components (both existing and those which may appear in the future) to be tested, but only those which are stationary and ground-launched and not those which are space-, air-, sea-, or mobile surface-launched.

But the U.S. side invented the so-called "broad interpretation" of the ABM Treaty, whereby the restrictions and prohibitions only supposedly apply to ABM systems and components based on the traditional technologies which existed at the time the treaty was signed and to missiles. Thus the creation, including tests in any spheres, of ABM systems or their components with any type of launch mechanism is supposedly permissible if they are based on "new physical principles." Here they mean such new types of weapons as lasers, beam weapons, and so on.

Such an "interpretation" does not stand up to any criticism. The treaty strictly defines the concept of the "ABM system": This is any system "to combat strategic ballistic missiles or their elements in flight." The universality of the entire treaty, that is its extension to ABM systems which could be created in the future, stems from the universality of the definition of "ABM system."

Let us recall that M.S. Gorbachev stated in an interview with the U.S. national television company NBC prior to his trip to Washington: "We have expressed our position clearly: We are prepared to embark on a 50-percent reduction while strictly observing the ABM Treaty at the first stage. Let America act and carry out research, certainly, as long as SDI does not contravene the ABM Treaty—as long as SDI does not contravene the ABM Treaty."

I must point out that Soviet proposals concerning the observance of the ABM Treaty regime envisaged agreeing a list of devices which would be permitted or banned from being put into space in the course of research work. What does this mean? There are systems already working in orbit, for instance, observation and early warning satellites. There are what are called sensory identification systems. But anything that can strike, knock down, or destroy must be banned in space. A list of devices agreed on by the sides to be banned from being put into space if their characteristics overstep the agreed criteria would make it possible to strictly control research in the ABM sphere. All this, undoubtedly, creates favorable conditions for securing an agreement on compliance with and nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

Nonetheless, the U.S. Administration is continuing to insist on the "broad interpretation" of the treaty. One cannot help concluding that this is being done to create artificial barriers in the way of deepening the nuclear disarmament process. At the same time the reluctance to agree to comply with the ABM Treaty is, evidently, occasioned by serious misgivings on the part of "Star Wars" supporters over the fate of SDI.

First, the popularity of SDI among Americans in the first few years after it was announced was due to the fact that it was presented as a program to create "total defense" against nuclear missiles. It has now become clear that this "umbrella" would in any case be "holey" and that it can only be a question in the foreseeable future of creating ABM defense with extremely limited efficiency, mainly to protect military targets. So support for it has sharply declined in the United States.

Second, the program is being exposed to the paralyzing influence of the positive processes in Soviet-U.S. relations. According to the results of a public opinion poll, Americans prefer arms reduction to "Star Wars" in the ratio of 2:1. "Given that the Russians are proposing a significant reduction in nuclear arms," the U.S. magazine NEWSWEEK wrote recently, "the public may in its rapture demand that the next president abandons SDI." Most Americans—73 percent, as THE WASHINGTON POST revealed last December—think that the USSR is serious in its desire to achieve progress in the sphere of reducing nuclear arsenals.

Third, definite changes have emerged in the approach to SDI even in the heart of the U.S. military-industrial complex. The intensification of work in the SDI sphere, especially the move to deploy it in space, will demand annual appropriations for these purposes of $15-20 billion or more, according to U.S. specialists' estimates. U.S. economic difficulties and the oversaturation of the military budget do not, essentially, leave room for financing costly new programs without substantially cutting other items in the Pentagon budget. The prospect of allocating huge sums to SDI at the expense of other programs is causing concern among the representatives of the military-industrial complex.

The recent statement by Vice Admiral W. Ramsey, who is deputy head of the U.S. Armed Forces combined Space Command, was extremely revealing in this respect. "In my opinion, we must agree that there should be no weapons in space," he stated at a forum in the Brookings Institute. "We must set ourselves the task of excluding the siting of armaments in space." In his opinion, a U.S.-Soviet treaty banning the use of weapons in space "is an extremely worthwhile aim."

Taking into consideration the factors enumerated above, we can obviously hope for common sense to prevail in Washington and for a realization to penetrate there of the full measure of responsibility which the United States, just like the USSR, bears for consolidating strategic stability and removing the threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

Scientist Calls SDI Components 'Impracticable'

PM251055 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Mar 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Academician Vitaliy Iosifovich Goldanskiy, chairman of the Soviet Pugwash Committee and deputy chairman of the Committee of Soviet Scientists for the Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat, by S. Guk: "A Way Out of the Impasse Into Which SDI Supporters Are Threatening To Drag Mankind"; date and place not given—first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] Five years ago U.S. President Reagan, speaking on national television, announced that "the order has been given for a long-term program designed to eliminate the threat from nuclear missiles." A program which is to swallow up trillions of dollars without creating additional security for the United States. Moreover: Moving armaments into space will mean destabilization with unforeseeable consequences. SDI will be a brake on the process of nuclear missile disarmament.

The IZVESTIYA editorial office asked Academician Vitaliy Iosifovich Goldanskiy, chairman of the Soviet Pugwash Committee and deputy chairman of the Committee of Soviet Scientists for the Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat, to sum up the preliminary results and voice his ideas on the future of the planet with a view to the "Star Wars" factor.

[Guk] How far has the United States progressed in these 5 years?

[Goldanskiy] I do not take it upon myself to judge all the directions of the work. Take one component which has caused such a fuss—the nuclear-pumped X-ray laser. This topic is closer to my range of interests since I was once myself involved on a gamma-ray laser. U.S. scientists do not have a united viewpoint on this. Scientists are continually arguing at the Livermore laboratory itself, which is the main developer of the X-ray laser. Skeptics consider this to simply pouring money into a project which is clearly impracticable.

Here is something strange: When we were discussing the problems associated with nuclear tests at a specialized international symposium recently, I asked one of the men from Livermore the question: Do you really, seriously think that you can create an X-ray laser system which will be able to intercept many hundreds of missiles? He said: No, we don't, but this work is being done in our country in order to see whether the Russians can do this. Quite fantastic!

There have also been other reports: The SDI concepts originally submitted have undergone substantial changes and been trivialized, in order, for instance, to demonstrate the rapid success of the missile destruction program using entirely conventional missiles which use chemical fuel. When they talk about early deployment they are pursuing above all the aim of avoiding reductions in appropriations. They are trying to give the impression that some breakthroughs have already been made, when in fact the entire program is constantly being rehashed as it goes along. If they had adhered to the original project they would have had to admit the need to continually postpone the commissioning date.

[Guk] Incidentally, did SDI supporters promise the population 100-percent defense in the beginning ?

[Goldanskiy] No one thinks about that now. The overwhelming majority of U.S. scientists consider SDI as announced to be technically infeasible, costly, and politically damaging. It is supported by the staffs of arms laboratories, which essentially make a living out of this

SDI—they carry on their own way. But there is also a third group, who are rarely mentioned: I would call them the window-dressers. They are people who try to present their proposals in such a way that they have some, albeit purely external, connection with SDI and thus obtain funds from the Pentagon.

[Guk] Allow me to ask an amateurish question: Suppose the 100-percent defense system is set up. Let us presume that only the unprotected part of the planet will suffer in the event of conflict. Will the part that is protected survive in that case?

[Goldanskiy] It is enough for one side to explode its existing stocks of nuclear warheads on its territory for human civilization inevitably to perish. The only difference is that the suicide finishes himself off instantly, whereas a slow, excruciating death awaits the others.

[Guk] Are we, perhaps, talking today about a group of politicians and military men whose thinking is typical of the World War I era and who have gotten their hands on terrible equipment but continue to think in terms of howitzers and aircraft?

[Goldanskiy] Let us not even take a nuclear war. The earth is now overloaded in terms of power sources—with nuclear power stations. The complete destruction of a 1 million-kilowatt nuclear reactor would be equivalent in terms of its short-term radiation effect to the explosion of a 1-megaton bomb. As for long-term radiation consequences, 1 million kilowatts is equivalent to a 10-megaton explosion. Moreover the total capacity of the planet's nuclear power stations is approximately 400 million kilowatts.

[Guk] What does this mean?

[Goldanskiy] The long-term radiation effect is equivalent to 4,000 megatons. Yet the total combat supplies on hand are now estimated at 5,000-10,000 megatons. If the nuclear power stations were destroyed, their total radioactive effect would be equivalent to global nuclear war.

[Guk] So the earth must not be touched now.

[Goldanskiy] Under no circumstances. For instance, we do not even know all the possible remote after-effects of radiation on the living world. The difference in the genetic structure of a man and that of a gorilla or chimpanzee is quite small, so it is difficult to even imagine the product of the mutations engendered by the long-term global effects of radiation.

[Guk] Why then is there so much fuss and so many misgivings about SDI?

[Goldanskiy] You know, this can all be compared to a chemical reaction that is constantly accelerating. The sensation which arose immediately in the United States over SDI has not left us neutral. In fact, any point on the state borders was always described by two coordinates—latitude and longitude. SDI threatens the creation of a third measurement for the danger zone, because a state's sovereignty does not extend to space. When we voice our misgivings about SDI, it is by no means because it deprives us of the possibility of inflicting a retaliatory strike—we ourselves are proposing to eliminate and reduce arms and create a system of nonoffensive defense. We can only be alarmed by the unpredictable consequences of huge capital investments in military research.

But the stormy reaction on our part gave the program's supporters false illusions: Aha, if the Russians are afraid, that means everything is correct. It means, all else being equal, that our strike will be the stronger...

[Guk] At one time SDI supporters seized on M.S. Gorbachev's statement that we are also involved in basic research into the aspects encompassed by U.S. SDI research. For that reason they are now trying to use it for self-justification.

[Goldanskiy] We are carrying out extensive space research. Proclaiming that this research bears a relation to SDI is a pretty constant trend in the West. We recently met with a group of U.S. senators and researchers at the level of the Committee of Soviet Scientists for the Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat. Talk turned to the laser designed for the "Phobos" project—there has already been fuss that this is also a project for putting a laser into space, an element in a Soviet SDI. Academician Sagdeyev cited specific figures, and it turned out that this laser's beam has an intensity 100 million times less than that needed for military purposes. So I am not surprised by the fuss about a Soviet SDI which is supposedly on the point of being commissioned—this is the usual propaganda approach.

[Guk] So, SDI is a senseless venture in all respects, but we are continuing to talk about it as if it were a threat...

[Goldanskiy] I repeat—the threat lies in the unpredictability of the results of the scientific research, which could threaten the earth from space. Today the crazy amounts of money that the United States is, for example, investing in SDI, can be compared with a gambler's desire to ruin his rivals and take the jackpot. There are also elements of bluff here but at the same time, knowing the history of scientific development, we can predict even now that these capital investments will produce some results, not only in the military sphere.

[Guk] In that case it is quite unnecessary to carry out the scientific research within the SDI framework.

[Goldanskiy] Of course. In the case in question the gigantic sums are primarily serving to strive for supremacy in space. No one can tell today what will come of this. That is the destabilizing element. The fate of mankind will be handed over to computers. Here are some figures: The SDI control system is to have a

program running to 100 million lines. This amount of information can be compared to a library containing 5,000 volumes each with 300 pages. The text must not contain a single misprint. The risk of a malfunction is colossal. But let us sidestep SDI. Science in general is becoming increasingly costly. Computerization is taking place and experimental equipment is becoming more complex. Gigantic projects affecting general human interests must be international.

[Guk] Do you, as a scientist, have your own plan for a "space defense" which would indeed strengthen global security?

[Goldanskiy] I believe I do, and I will try to explain my thinking. The era of nuclear deterrence, at the initial stage, when the U.S. monopoly on nuclear weapons was broken, was important in terms of stabilization. The nuclear balance then acted as a brake in the way of war. But now, given the nuclear equipment available, even conventional warfare is becoming inadmissible. The idea of nuclear deterrence has become obsolete. The Soviet program of disarmament for development reflects the new realities of the era. We want to enter into relations founded on mutual trust. We must strive for peaceful coexistence and the development of all countries, without attempting to foist on them anything from outside. How can we move on from the stage of protracted confrontation to confidence—the basis of such a world order? In my opinion, this is bound to be a protracted stage, which I call verification [verifikatsionnyy] deterrence (the English word "verification" [verifikatsiya] is rendered "kontrol" or "proverka" in Russian—S.G.). Deterrence based not on force of arms but on strict mutual verification against a backdrop of gradually reduced armaments. A system of earth surveillance from space must be developed. Both sides must have an opportunity to reliably monitor one another to gradually learn to trust one another.

Anniversary of 'Adventurist' SDI Program Noted

PM241031 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Mar 88 Second Edition p 3

[D. Klimov article: "Five Years of SDI: What Next?"]

[Text] It is 5 years since the day U.S. President R. Reagan proclaimed the program for the creation [sozdaniye] of a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements, which subsequently received the official title "Strategic Defense Initiative." In our view, however, those who described it as the "Star Wars" program were far more accurate.

The President did not provide a clear definition of what the system he proposed would be like. But he declared that it was designed to make nuclear arms "impotent and obsolete" and so would remove the threat of nuclear war. In fact, that is far from true. The real purpose of SDI is to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union. In a statement to the Senate Armed Services Committee, C. Weinberger, then U.S. defense secretary, cynically admitted that. Here are his additional words: "If we were able to acquire a system that was efficient, and if we knew that it could make their arms (that is, the Soviet Union's arms—D.K.) impotent, we would return to the situation where we were the only country to possess nuclear weapons."

The extremely dangerous nature of such a program was obvious right from the start. The very next day after R. Reagan's statement, Congressman T. Downey declared that the President's proposal to create [sozdaniye] an ABM system in outer space "is a most horrific and absurd idea." "The President believes that lasers and beam weapons would be defensive by nature, but it is quite obvious that this is not so," another congressman—J. Moody—pointed out. "The creation [sozdaniye] of more sophisticated arms," he continued, "can lead only to the creation [sozdaniye] of more powerful counterarms." Another congressman—L. Aucoin—said these words: "The President wants military superiority. But the Soviets will not stand still or allow us to achieve superiority. Instead, they will create [sozdat] new arms which will in turn be capable of neutralizing space arms."

As though summing up all these statements, THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote: "The President decided to develop research work on a new type of ABM system, despite the fact that many of his aides at the White House and the Defense Department believed that this idea had not been studied sufficiently." Valid concern was also aroused by the fact that the implementation of SDI runs counter to the 1972 Soviet-U.S. treaty on the limitation of ABM systems. It is no coincidence that even now, in the early stages of SDI implementation, the administration is trying to circumvent its provisions by resorting to the so-called "broad interpretation" and, essentially, rejecting a number of the treaty's provisions.

The opposition to the "Star Wars" program even among U.S. legislators is evidenced by the fact that Congress is systematically reducing the administration's requests for funds to be allocated to SDI. Thus, the request for fiscal 1988 was cut from $5.7 billion to 3.9 billion. The idea of a "broad interpretation" of the ABM Treaty has not met with the expected support in the Senate either.

Nevertheless, the United States has been carrying out intensive developments [razrabotki] in the ABM sphere throughout the 5 years. Although Lieutenant General J. Abrahamson, who heads the SDI organization, has acknowledged that budget cuts have somewhat slowed down the pace of research, he did, however, declare that the SDI organization has entirely abandoned the examination of only a small number of systems.

A considerable role is undoubtedly played here by pressure from the military-industrial corporations, which reckon on making superprofits out of implementing the program. But probably no less significant is the fact that champions of "Star Wars" have managed to enlist considerable support by means of a forceful propaganda campaign. For the average American, who does not understand all the subtleties of foreign and military policy, the promises to safeguard the country against a possible nuclear strike with the help of a "space shield" appear very alluring. Many Americans have been in thrall to the usual illusions and stereotypes. So many people in the United States, even those who are skeptical about SDI, deem it necessary to continue research to find an answer to the question of the possibility, from a scientific and technical viewpoint, of creating [sozdaniye] a strategic defense system.

What is the position today with this widely publicized program? The signing of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles has opened up new prospects on the way to achieving still more radical nuclear arms reductions. The realization that SDI could be a serious obstacle to the achievement of corresponding agreements, above all on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms, has still further increased skepticism about it. "SDI makes a nuclear war more likely," E. Carroll, deputy director of Washington's Center for Defense Information, emphasized, "because it pushes toward a buildup of offensive nuclear arms. And yet it is precisely this process that the United States and the Soviet Union are seeking to reverse during the Geneva talks on reducing strategic arms." This is why such fundamental significance attaches to the point written into the Soviet-U.S. joint statement adopted in Washington 10 December 1987, to the effect that the two countries' leaders have entrusted their delegations in Geneva with "elaborating an accord which will oblige the sides to observe the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972 in the process of carrying out the research, development [razrabotki], and, where necessary, testing permitted under the ABM Treaty and not to abrogate the ABM Treaty during the agreed term."

The U.S. press reports that SDI has also encountered a number of purely technical problems. In the opinion of U.S. specialists, its programs in the spheres of command and management, without which the whole system cannot function, are "suffering total failure." NEWSWEEK magazine, for example, believes that "unless there is some unforeseen technological leap, SDI is threatened with gradually fading away."

However, champions of "Star Wars" are seeking to give it a new boost and achieve its unconditional implementation. Attempts are being made to rehabilitate the program in the technical respect. The tests within the SDI framework designed, in the opinion of its adherents, to convince skeptics of the program's efficiency and technical feasibility are aimed at this.

Thus, in December 1987 the first ground tests of a laser code-named "Zenith Star" were conducted on a Californian range. And in February 1988 another experiment was conducted within the SDI framework—"Delta-181"—during which a laser radar was put into orbit and tested. Originally this experiment costing 250 million dollars was declared "very successful." However, later it became known that one of the sensors, which was the most important among the other analogous instruments launched into space, had gone out of commission.

Certain U.S. figures are already proposing the rejection of the ambitious plans to create [sozdaniye] a "space shield" and the reorientation of research within the SDI framework toward developing [razrabotka] a considerably more modest system. But this is a complex issue. Thus, Senator S. Nunn has proposed turning SDI into a "sensible defense initiative." "If we cautiously changed the thrust of our research, it could enable us to develop [razrabotat] limited systems to counter the frightening possibility of an accidental or unsanctioned launch," Nunn declared. But champions of SDI are inclined to regard this proposal as a first step toward deploying a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements. This was said by Abrahamson, in particular, who called Nunn's proposal "very constructive."

It is still too early to draw a conclusion on how events will develop further around SDI. Its future appears rather uncertain. But there is no doubt that today it remains an adventurist undertaking with extremely dangerous consequences.

Gerasimov Gives Press Briefing 29 Mar

Condemns Use of Gas in Gulf

LD291242 Moscow TASS in English 1205 GMT 29 Mar 88

[Text] Moscow March 29 TASS—Reports about massive use of chemical weapons in the Iran-Iraq conflict have aroused profound concern in the Soviet Union, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said at a briefing here today.

Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Ministry's Information Directorate, said such facts are a violation of the Geneva protocol of 1925. They are "actions which, in the Soviet Union's opinion, deserve to be strongly condemned", he added.

"The Geneva protocol, which prohibits the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous and other gases and of bacteriological methods of warfare, must be observed by all parties to it.

"Violating it is inadmissible, runs counter to the norms of civilization and humanity, and cannot be justified by any considerations. This concerns the sides involved in the given conflict as well," Gerasimov continued.

"The Soviet Union condemns and will condemn any use of chemical weapons in violation of the Geneva protocol of 1925, regardless of who has violated it and under what circumstances," he declared.

Welcomes Nicaraguan Agreement

LD291253 Moscow Tass in English 1227 GMT 29 Mar 88

[Text] Moscow March 29 TASS—"People in the Soviet Union welcome the agreement signed by the Nicaraguan Government and the leaders of the armed opposition on the temporary halt of combat operations in the entire territory of the country and the holding of negotiations in the near future to reach an accord on a final ceasefire", Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, said today.

Speaking to Soviet and foreign journalists at a briefing at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center, he noted that the signing of the agreement was a forceful confirmation of the Nicaraguan Government's determination to fulfill in their entirety the commitments assumed by it together with the governments of other Central American countries under the Guatemalan accords that provide for attaining agreements on ceasefire and national reconciliation through a dialogue with the opposition in those countries in the region where combat operations are conducted.

"People in the Soviet Union give credit to the Sandinist Government's flexibility and persistence in reaching the agreement on reconciliation and express the hope that the other side and those who support it will refrain from actions which can stymie this agreement and block once again the efforts aimed at a total cessation of the fratricidal war. If this responsible approach is displayed in other Central American countries as well, political settlement in that region can become a reality", the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman emphasized.

Reagan Aide, Senators in Moscow

LD291359 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1320 GMT 29 Mar 88

[Text] Moscow, 29 Mar (TASS)—"Since 27 March, a group has been here to prepare for U.S. President Ronald Reagan's visit to the Soviet Union," Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, announced at a briefing today for Soviet and foreign journalists. The group is led by Thomas Griscom, assistant to the president for communications and planning. The purpose of their coming is to continue finding out about the places which Mr President and Mrs. Nancy Reagan will probably visit.

The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman noted that this was a continuation of the work which had been started by the group during its first visit to the USSR from 4 to 9 March.

The group had meetings with representatives of the USSR Foreign Ministry and other Soviet departments for the purpose of an initial "rough" discussion of the program for the President's and Mrs. Nancy Reagan's stay in the Soviet Union. The group flies back tomorrow.

Gennadiy Gerasimov also announced that from 1 to 10 April, at the invitation of the USSR parliamentary group, a large delegation of U.S. senators will be in the Soviet Union, led by Bennett Johnston, chairman of the Senate Committee for Energy and Natural Resources. The delegation will visit Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev. The U.S. legislators' visit reflects the momentum which the political dialogue in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States is acquiring.

"The Soviet side hopes that this will promote better mutual understanding and cooperation between the USSR and the United States," the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said.

Denies Advisers Killed

LD291440 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1355 GMT 29 Mar 88

[Text] Moscow, 29 Mar (TASS)—The situation at the Afghan-Pakistani talks held in Geneva through the personal representative of the UN secretary general is such that agreements can be signed immediately, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, announced at a briefing here today.

The documents comprising the political settlement of the external aspects of the Afghan problem have been basically agreed upon. Therefore, only realism and goodwill are needed for them to be signed. However, additional conditions and pretexts have appeared from the direction of Pakistan and the United States. The latest of these is the U.S. condition regarding the so-called moratorium on Soviet military aid to Afghanistan in exchange for a halt to U.S. aid to the forces striving by means of arms to overthrow the government in Kabul. This condition has only arisen now and it is not justified. The problem of a moratorium or "symmetry" has been brought up by the United States only now, which is, incidentally, admitted by the Pakistani side. This was done, evidently, to disrupt the signing of the Geneva agreements. This is unacceptable to us.

However, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman stressed, the talks are continuing, and in the final analysis we can do without a U.S. guarantee. The U.S. military aid to the forces of armed opposition in Afghanistan is passed via Pakistan's generals. If Islamabad signs the agreements that have been worked out and that include the recognition of mutual noninterference in each other's internal affairs, Pakistan will thus have to stop passing on U.S. military aid to the armed opposition in Afghanistan.

The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman refuted today's report by the REUTER agency that four Soviet military advisers are supposed to have been killed as the result of a bomb blast in Kabul on Sunday. Nothing of the sort has happened. All the Soviet advisers are alive and well. According to the Soviet ambassador in Kabul, there were two explosions in Kabul last week, and not "at least another five," as the REUTER report said, but they did not have any particular consequences. The situation in Kabul is perfectly calm at the moment.

Summit Arms Agreement Possible

LD291509 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1425 GMT 29 Mar 88

[Text] Moscow, 29 Mar (TASS)—The Soviet side reckons that if an effort is made, then it is possible to prepare draft agreements on 50-percent cuts in strategic nuclear weapons for signing during the Moscow summit, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Administration of the USSR Foreign Ministry, said today at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists.

Gennadiy Gerasimov noted that the U.S. side is making reservations and promoting the idea that it is better not to have an agreement than to have a bad agreement. "This is quite a false contrast. Why a bad agreement? Let us talk about a good agreement," the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said. "If the diplomats roll up their sleeves and get to work in Geneva, then it is possible to conclude an agreement. But if it is not ready, the talks must be continued, and there should be no pause."

Replying to a question about progress of the Geneva talks to draft a convention on banning chemical weapons, Gennadiy Gerasimov stated that "progress there is possible, and a relevant agreement could be concluded very soon." However, things are being held up primarily because of the stance of the United States, which refers to the difficulty of verification. On the other hand, France in general considers it necessary to create a chemical arsenal to insure its security. These two points bring a note of pessimism into the picture. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union reckons, as was reaffirmed at the Washington summit, that both the USSR and the United States aspire to the banning of chemical weapons.

Replying to a question about the United States' intention to assist the modernization of the Turkish army, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said: "Regrettably, the United States is not paying due attention to Soviet proposals for the creation of a zone of peace, security and cooperation in the Mediterranean. It is probably easy to understand this from the Pentagon's point of view, because the United States keeps its 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean, and sometimes their ships enter the Black Sea via the Dardanelles, even though the Black Sea is a very long way from the United States."

The Soviet Union, said Gennadiy Gerasimov, supports the constructive steps by Vietnam to resolve disputes with China at the negotiating table, and not in the battlefield. In this connection, he recalled that on 26 March the Vietnamese Ministry of Foreign Affairs sent the Chinese Foreign Ministry a note supporting the Chinese side's proposal of 17 and 23 March for talks aimed at resolving disagreements between the two sides concerning the Truong Sa Islands (Spratley Islands), and also other border issues. Until agreement is reached on starting talks, the Vietnamese side suggests that they refrain from using force and avoid military clashes.

Nagorno-Karabakh Not Normal Yet

LD291523 Moscow TASS in English 1506 GMT 29 Mar 88

[Text] Moscow March 29 TASS—In answer to journalists' questions at a briefing here today, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said the Nagorno-Karabakh situation did not yet fully come back to normal. In Stepanakert, in particular, some enterprises were out of operation. At the same time with reference to a telephone conversation with Yerevan, he said there was tranquility in the capital of Armenia.

The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman recalled in this connection that, if one is to believe some foreign radio stations, a demonstration was to be held in Yerevan on Saturday—there was no such demonstration—and that a stay-at-home day was to be observed. There was nothing of the kind either.

Touching upon the character of broadcasts of foreign radio stations, Gennadiy Gerasimov pointed out that there was a substantial difference between reports on developments that really took place, on the one hand, and forecasts or instructions—what, where and when should be done—on the other. At all events, he emphasized, the instructions did not work, and Saturday in Yerevan was a normal day.

In answer to the question about the causes of developments in Transcaucasia, Gennadiy Gerasimov said, in particular, that they were rooted in errors that had been made in the pursuance of the nationalities policy in the course of many years.

"There should be no fratricidal strife between brothers. This runs counter to the Leninist policy of nationalities. But an external enemy can very easily parasitize on the difficulties and, posing as an upholder of human rights, can stir up national strife," the spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs emphasized.

Kashlev Assesses Vienna CSCE Negotiations

Third Basket 'Most Complicated'

LD272228 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 27 Mar 88

[Text] In the capital of Austria another round has ended in the Vienna meetings of the representatives of countries taking part in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Our correspondent met with Ambassador Yuriy Borisovich Kashlev, head of the Soviet Union's delegation at the Vienna meetings. Listen to what Kashlev told him:

[Begin Kashlev recording] Here in Vienna the military and political issue is being discussed at two forums. The first is in accordance with the First Basket of the general Vienna meeting and then there are the consultations taking place in parallel among the 23 member-countries of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO, to work out a mandate for fresh talks on reductions in armed forces and arms from the Atlantic to the Urals.

At the former of these forums, for the first time all the groups of countries submitted their projects for the military section of that document. The focal issue there is that of the resumption, immediately in the wake of Vienna, of the conference on measures to strengthen trust and security and on disarmament in Europe. That practice which has now become commonplace in the overall European process and after Stockholm will be developed. There will be new measures of trust, which is very important.

And at the latter of these forums, at the consultations of the 23 countries of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO, definite progress has also been made in these 2 months. I have just read in the newspaper that Eduard Amvrosievich Shevardnadze has proposed in Washington exchanging data on our troops and armaments in Europe in general with the Americans, with the NATO countries, in the next few months, without even waiting for the start of those talks that we have agreed upon. This means that we are taking a strong, offensive, clearcut position in respect to verification [kontrol] issues and exchange of information on troops.

Finally, in the so-called Third Basket—these are questions of the humanitarian aspect of the Helsinki process, that is, contacts among people, culture, information, and we relate human rights problems to this as well—here the situation is most complicated. Here two lines are, as it were, coming up against one another. We on the socialist side are in favor of the development of extensive contacts, especially between mass organizations, youth, women's, trade union, public organizations, so that the procedure of visa formalities should be simplified, so that the safety of those taking part in such exchanges would be ensured, so that favorable conditions should be created for them, and so forth. But the Western countries are inclined to be in favor of so-called individual contacts. We are not opposed to them, but that is no substitute for those exchanges in which a million people take part. And in general Western delegations somehow act as if they are programmed, when it comes to this sphere of human rights and contacts between people, to reduce everything to the categories of individual contacts, to questions of emigration, to questions of certain religious freedoms, to the activity of the so-called Helsinki observation groups, and so forth. Here the only way out is for everyone to get on a realistic footing. It has been said that it is in actual fact possible and necessary for people not to put excessive emphasis on things of perhaps secondary importance, because in this basket the situation is the most complicated. All the same, as a whole the last stage in our meeting is regarded as the light at the end of the tunnel. [end recording]

'Hopes of Success'

PM300937 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Mar 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent S. Tosunyan dispatch: "Deciding Round Lies Ahead"]

[Text] Vienna—The latest round of talks at the Vienna meeting of the 35 CSCE states is over.

Before leaving for home for their recess, the delegation leaders, addressing press representatives, gave their assessments of the work that has been done. For the first time in the many months since the start of the Vienna meeting their statements were optimistic. This optimism was based on the fact that working documents from all the groups of countries—the Warsaw Pact, the neutral and nonaligned states, and the NATO countries—have finally been worked out and submitted for discussion on

the most complex range of issues: military security. Of course, agreement is still needed, but it can already be stated that positions have definitely come closer together.

I asked Yu.B. Kashlev, head of the USSR delegation, to discuss the Soviet position at the Vienna meeting:

[Kashlev] Indeed, at the last round of talks hopes of success did appear during the discussion of military issues and, to a certain extent, humanitarian issues. Substantive progress has been achieved at the consultations between the 23 Warsaw Pact and NATO countries being held within the framework of the Vienna meeting on working out a mandate for new talks on reductions in armed forces and conventional arms from the Atlantic to the Urals. The preamble to the mandate has already been agreed upon. It lays down the fundamental provision that these new talks will also be conducted within the framework of the CSCE process.

The important section of the mandate for the talks pertaining to verification and information exchange has been laid down [zafiksirovan]. This information should be sufficiently detailed to enable meaningful comparisons between the member states' troops and arms to take place. It is also planned to resolve the key problem of the subject of the talks, clearly pointing out that they will cover dual-purpose systems.

Drafting work on humanitarian issues has finally gotten moving.

However, the situation with regard to questions of cooperation in the sphere of the economy, science, and the environment is still unsatisfactory. The discussion of these issues has been very slow and the ideas proposed have been poor and do not correspond to the standards of international and scientific life.

In the corridors of the Vienna meeting one often hears talk about the "human dimension" of the Helsinki process and the corresponding mechanism for it. But for some reason a specific examination has still not begun of subsequent measures, including the Soviet proposals to hold a conference in Moscow on the development of humanitarian cooperation. Our Western partners are still waiting for something.

Against the background of the successes and failures of the round that has just ended, all partners in the talks should use the recess to do some thinking and realize that we can only succeed in this great common cause and ensure further development in cooperation by realistically taking each other's interests into account.

A difficult stage lies ahead of us, Yu.B. Kashlev said in conclusion. We hope that this will be the final and deciding stage. We are pinning great hopes on an increase in the constructive objectivity of the neutral and nonaligned countries, and they will soon submit their full draft final document. The success of the Vienna meeting will largely depend on the quality and realistic nature of this document and the time taken to submit it.

Drobkov Reviews Arms Talks, Central America
PM291151 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 88 Second Edition p 4

["International Review" by Vladislav Drobkov: "The World Last Week"]

[Text] During the meeting 22 March with President Julio Maria Sanguinetti of Uruguay, who was visiting Moscow, M.S. Gorbachev noted: "The world has changed and continues to change in such a way that the need for an improvement of the international climate is becoming increasingly urgent. The peoples refuse to accept tension, the arms race, and economic adversity. The politicians' task is to catch those feelings and reflect them in appropriate actions."

These words, I believe, are in tune with the main theme of the difficult creative work now being done to lay the path to a safer, more humane world, free of the threat of nuclear apocalypse. A path which is still obstructed by various types of weapons, with yawning gulfs of hostility and distrust, and where centers of regional conflict blaze. The new political thinking and the refusal to abide by the stereotypes of the past can help mankind overcome all these obstacles. But for that it is necessary for political leaders and the broad international public to realize the futility of the attempts to impose one's will on others, to achieve a greater measure of security for oneself compared with others, and to deceive or crush the other side.

In those places where this realization has dawned, solutions have been found to complex problems which only recently were termed insoluble. But in those places where the development of the situation is determined by the old dogma of confrontation and where reliance on force relegates reason to the background, clashes and disputes not only are not conducive to a settlement of existing contradictions but aggravate them still further and make them harder to resolve. The past week's events provide evidence of that.

Dialogue in Washington [subhead]

E.A. Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister, held talks in the U.S. capital last week. During those talks the date of the new meeting between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the President of the United States was fixed. It is set for Moscow between 29 May and 2 June this year.

A further two rounds of talks between leaders of the Soviet and U.S. foreign policy departments are due before that event takes place. If you take into account the fact that their current meeting in Washington was the 23d in a little over 2 years, there are fresh grounds for noting the continuing intensification of the Soviet-U.S.

dialogue. It is focused on the most important questions. It is acquiring an increasingly businesslike character. In Washington the search continued for mutually acceptable solutions to enable R. Reagan's forthcoming visit to the USSR to be as productive as M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the United States in December.

After the conclusion of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles in December, the generally acknowledged priority is the question of a Soviet-U.S. agreement on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive armaments in conditions of the observance of the ABM Treaty. Such an agreement is being worked out in Geneva at present. And it is common knowledge that the path to it was laid by the three summits—in Geneva, Reykjavik, and Washington.

These facts alone permit one to discuss the changed nature of mutual relations between our countries and the possibility of transferring to a qualitatively new level and content of international relations.

Judging by the statements of the direct participants in the latest Washington meetings and conversations and by press responses, a definite step forward was made on many questions there. There was a frank and businesslike exchange of opinions on human rights and humanitarian problems. There was confirmation of the firm commitment to make strenuous efforts to complete the elaboration of a treaty on the reduction and limitation of strategic offensive armaments and all the related documents, preferably so that they may be signed during the forthcoming summit. There was an examination of the situation in Geneva regarding the coordination of questions of observing the ABM Treaty. There was progress at the Soviet-U.S. talks on questions connected with the nuclear test problem, and instructions were issued to our delegations. The situation in the sphere of armed forces and conventional armaments was also analyzed. There was a discussion of multilateral and bilateral talks concerned with the truly global banning of chemical weapons. Many other problems were examined, too.

Among the important aspects of the meeting, I would highlight the Soviet side's options for verification mechanisms for sea- and air-launched long-range cruise missiles and mobile ICBM's. Without going into the technical details of those options, it may be stated that in principle they open up the way to the solution of verification questions, which are the most complex at the talks.

At the same time a remarkable situation has come about during the discussion of the balance of NATO and Warsaw Pact conventional armaments and armed forces. As is well known, the North Atlantic bloc has been expressing constant alarm at the Warsaw Pact's "vast superiority" over NATO in this sphere. The Soviet side has proposed beginning in April the coordination of a list of statistics on these armaments and forces deployed from the Atlantic to the Urals and in May the exchanging of those statistics. However, the Americans have not shown any interest in discussing this question. Yet at a recent NATO Council session in Brussels, the heads of state and government of that bloc demanded that the Warsaw Pact eliminate the "imbalance" with regard to conventional armaments. Or does publication of the precise data in this sphere not suit NATO?

Nor can I call the U.S. position during the examination of certain regional conflicts a constructive one. For example, judging by reports from Washington, the U.S. side tried essentially to slow down and complicate the solution of the Afghan question and to raise artificial obstacles in its path. For example, obstacles such as the demand for a symmetrical reduction in or cessation of the Soviet and U.S. aid to the opposing sides. The Soviet side rejected those maneuvers and attempts to interfere in Afghanistan's internal affairs.

The Soviet side also adopted a clear-cut stance with regard to the ABM Treaty. As E.A. Shevardnadze stated at a press conference in Washington, "there will not be a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive armaments unless the ABM Treaty is observed at least during an agreed period."

Nevertheless, despite the persisting difference of views on a number of problems and questions, the Washington dialogue helped to deepen the understanding of which direction to work in and where to focus our efforts and attention to achieve further progress in nuclear disarmament and the creation of favorable preconditions for the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit.

The question of the legislative ratification of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles remains at the center of the world public's attention. Last week was particularly remarkable for the fact that attempts in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to torpedo the treaty, which was under discussion there, using so-called "killer amendments" were thwarted. Several of those amendments, proposed by Senators Helms and Pressler, were voted down by an overwhelming majority of committee members. March 29 is the date of the final vote in that committee, which is to give recommendations to the full Senate regarding ratification of the treaty. Leading U.S. commentators believe that the recommendations will be positive. There is also a good chance that the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles will be ratified by the Senate even though the opponents of this agreement have no intention of giving up. The group of senators united around Helms are threatening to use procedural devices and amendments to extend the discussion indefinitely.

The discussion of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles in the USSR Supreme Soviet is taking place in a more constructive spirit, although no less thoroughly, than in the U.S. Congress. I should like to hope that by the time of the next meeting between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and

the U.S. President, our two countries' supreme legislative organs will be able to complete the process of ratifying this truly historic document, which offers the prospect of creating a nuclear-free world. I should like to recall here that the Soviet Union has already unilaterally withdrawn its operational-tactical nuclear weapons from GDR and CSSR territory, thus setting the United States a good example.

The Impotence of Force [subhead]

Let us turn to the events in Central America. Washington's crude attempts to impose its will on Panama and the dispatch of over 3,000 U.S. soldiers to the Honduran border with Nicaragua last week raised the tension in that region to the danger level and created a direct threat of U.S. military intervention there. And even if the situation in Panama is still not clear in many respects, certain conclusions can already be drawn now from the events in Honduras and Nicaragua.

However, at first glance these conclusions seem quite paradoxical. For example, a few days ago a major offensive by the Sandinista army against the contra formations ended, resulting in the routing of the latter's forces in the north of the country. Even THE NEW YORK TIMES attests that as a result of that operation "a large contra base camp was eliminated. The Sandinistas destroyed weapons, munitions, and food, and—most important—they succeeded in depriving the contra forces of their safe haven." At the same time, last week saw the first meeting on Nicaraguan soil between representatives of the Nicaraguan Government and the contra leaders, which ended with the signing of a 60-day cease-fire agreement beginning 1 April. In other words, in the space of just a few days in Nicaragua hostilities flared up with renewed force and were then stifled again.

Washington is now trying to pretend that the dispatch of U.S. troops to Honduras stopped the further spread of hostilities on the border and helped to achieve a cease-fire. Even many U.S. commentators express doubt about the correctness of that version. First, the Managua government's talks with the contra leaders were planned long before the U.S. action. Furthermore, one aim of sending the GI's to Honduras, as a number of commentators attest, was to try to wreck those selfsame talks and complicate the search for ways to achieve a political settlement of the conflict which is being conducted within the Contadora process.

The U.S. troops transferred to Honduras, allegedly to participate in joint maneuvers with the Hondurans, will remain there a few days more. That small country is now playing host to over 6,000 crack U.S. troops armed to the teeth. That is several times more than the "hundreds of Sandinistas" who, according to official Washington's claims, crossed the Honduran border in pursuit of the fleeing contra gangs. As is well known, the Nicaraguan Government has denied that its troops are present on Honduran territory. So far neither Washington nor Tegucigalpa has produced documentary evidence of the Sandinistas' violation of the border. In this connection, many observers are coming to the conclusion that the loud anti-Nicaraguan campaign and the dispatch of troops were aimed not at "defending Nicaragua" but at "intimidating" Congress and the U.S. public.

By deliberately inflaming the regional conflict in Central America and fueling tension on the Nicaraguan border, the U.S. Administration is clearly trying to create the appropriate conditions for Congress to approve new aid shipments to the contras, aid which has been frozen since the end of February. However, this campaign was so crude and bellicose that it has had hardly any success.

In any event a recent public opinion poll showed that 56 percent of Americans do not support further aid to the contras, and more than one-half did not approve the sending of U.S. troops to Honduras. Many congressmen and a number of presidential contenders have sharply criticized the White House's actions. For example, Jesse Jackson termed them excessive and unnecessary. Michael Dukakis stated that policy in Central America is one of the current administration's biggest defeats. A wave of demonstrations has spread across the United States demanding the return of the troops and the forestalling of a "new Vietnam." All this allowed THE NEW YORK TIMES to publish an article recently on the situation in Central America under the highly significant headline: "The Fate of the Region Is Not in Washington's Hands."

Finally, one cannot fail to see the difficult situation in which Washington's bellicose action has placed its ally, Honduras. As it now seems, the Americans rushed to send their troops into that country without even waiting for an official invitation from its government. And Washington's much-publicized "repulsing of the Sandinista invasion" left Tegucigalpa in a highly delicate position. Here is THE WASHINGTON POST's comment on this matter: "If there are no contras in Honduras—and its President Jose Azcona insists that this is the case—were the Nicaraguans chasing shadows? Azcona was caught in a trap between four other Central American presidents and his boss, the United States, on which he is totally dependent for weapons and money. Azcona was slow to ask for U.S. assistance. Now he is refusing to allow a group of UN observers into his country (sent on a Nicaraguan initiative—V.D.). And that is understandable, because the first thing they will be able to see will be the contra camp whose presence is banned under the peace plan."

Thus, the U.S. strong-arm adventure has not only been unable to halt the process of seeking a political settlement of the situation in Nicaragua, as demonstrated by the cease-fire accord reached between the Sandinistas and the contras, it also undermined the position of the president of Honduras, a country which is merely paying lip service to its observance of the Guatemala accords. The attempt to use it to force congressmen to fund new aid to the contras has failed. In other words, the crude force on which Washington relies in Central America has demonstrated its impotence.

United States & Canada

Two Tomahawk Missiles Tested in Gulf of Mexico

LD292201 Moscow TASS in English 2130 GMT 29 Mar 88

[Text] New York March 29 TASS—The Pentagon tested two Tomahawk sea-based cruise missiles on Sunday and Monday.

Speaking at Eglin Field Base today, a spokesman for the U.S. Navy said that the missiles had been fired from two destroyers in the Gulf of Mexico and had traveled approximately 800 miles at altitudes varying from 150 to 2,000 metres over Florida and Alabama before hitting the target set.

Arbatov on 'Restructuring' Facing U.S.

LD291428 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1040 GMT 29 Mar 88

[From the program review of KOMMUNIST Issue No 5, presented by Boris Simonov with Georgiy Arbatov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the United States and Canada; date and place not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Simonov] I would like to introduce another person who has written for the magazine, Georgiy Arkadiyevich Arbatov, academician and director of the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of the United States and Canada. Georgiy Arkadiyevich, the article you contributed to KOMMUNIST magazine is called "Facing the Choice." The way I understand it is that this is a symbolic title—the United States at the moment faces having to choose not only a president, but also the policy it will inherit after Reagan. How do you explain U.S. policy today? [passage omitted]

[Arbatov] Reagan was an attempt to return to the old way, this was a kind of counterreformation, and I write about this in the article. A counterreformation attempt was made, the counterreformation has failed, and the United States again faces a choice.

[Simonov] Is it probably clear to them that the way Reagan went is a road that would not be followed?

[Arbatov] Well, you see, it is clear to some of them, but some of them simply cannot get away from this thinking, and these are not just the extreme right-wingers. The extreme right-wingers are of course energetically opposed, and since Reagan is close to them and has always represented them, they have now turned on Reagan, in general, even heaping obscenities on him in public speeches. But you understand, I think that in this they are not even the main force, because it was Reagan who gave them respectability, but Reagan is soon to go, his term ends in January. In fact, as he approaches this, he becomes an outgoing president with every passing month. Unfortunately the main force is also a considerable proportion of the traditional foreign policy brigade, including some very big names. They have grown up with the cold war. They do not approach things from the stance of the extreme right-wingers—that this is an evil empire, and that's all—no, they go a different way. In principle, the Russians and the Soviet Union remain the enemy as ever; they must not let themselves be disarmed, and if they trust Gorbachev and trust the Soviet Union, then the West will find itself in a very bad situation. They have a need for an enemy image.

[Simonov] Georgiy Arkadiyevich, there is the idea in your article that the United States now faces, perhaps, its own restructuring and glasnost. What did you have in mind?

[Arbatov] What I had in mind, first of all, is a frank discussion of what has happened. At the moment the election campaign discussion is in progress anyway, mainly concerning particular issues that express the substance of these changes—the budget deficit, the state debt, difficulties with allies. History faces every country with such problems from time to time—including us, we are no exception. [passage omitted] The Americans are now faced with restructuring in the sense that for 40 years their whole foreign policy, and to a certain extent their domestic economy and policies, and even, I would say, the way that Americans feel, ideologically and psychologically, has been built on a certain structure—that there is an evil empire—us—and a good empire—them. It is up to them to rally all who are on the right side around themselves, and head the resistance, and in general perhaps even go onto the offensive against the evil empire. One of the realities for everyone is the fact that there is another new thing in our interest—that is one of the themes of the article as well, that we have something new in our and the U.S. common interest, apart from the prevention of a nuclear war that would be equally ruinous for both sides. That is that domestic policy has come to the fore, the resolution of economic problems, both here and in the United States. [passage omitted]

At the moment, I look to the future with greater optimism than I did before, and probably many researchers, politicians, and members of the public too, will share this point of view. Why? Because common sense, which has always dictated that a fresh war is not possible, that there whould be no arms race and that cooperation is needed, is backed up by economic necessity and political necessity today, and this is a very big change for the better that permits one to look to the future with greater optimism, although not with euphoria. I can see that a lot of complicated work is ahead.

Soviet-U.S. Oncologists in Teleconference

LD291746 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1445 GMT29 Mar 88

[Text] Moscow, 29 Mar (TASS)—The quicker the disarmament process, the more money one can channel toward solving such global and human problems as the

battle against cancer-related diseases. This idea was stressed more than once today during a satellite television conference between the USSR and the United States. Well-known Soviet and U.S. oncologists, drawing a parallel between a nuclear war and cancer, suggested a "recipe" for both: prophylactics, early recognition, followed by effective surgery.

USSR Minister of Health Academician Yevgeniy Chazov read out to those taking part in the teleconference a greetings message from Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, who wished them good and fruitful cooperation in the interests of the health of Soviet and U.S. citizens, and in the interests of all people on earth. "The enemy has by no means been vanquished, it will not retreat, it threatens everyone", the Soviet leader stressed. "The fight against it requires concerted and unified action."

Speaking on the other side of the telebridge, U.S. President Ronald Reagan noted that the health of the peoples on earth depends on the joint efforts of the two countries' outstanding oncologists.

It was stressed during the television discussion that oncologists from the two countries have already accomplished a great deal in studying the causes and the mechanisms of the development of malignant tumors and working out prophylactic and treatment methods. A comparative appraisal of the methods of combating cancer has been carried out according to an agreed program and on this basis recommendations are being drawn up for practical health treatment. At the end of last year, a paper "Cancer and the Aging Process", prepared by their Leningrad colleagues, was sent to the Americans from the National Cancer Institute.

Gorbachev Greets Participants

LD291328 Moscow TASS in English 1315 GMT 29 Mar 88

[Text] Moscow March 29 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, today sent the following message of greeting to a TV conference of Soviet and U.S. oncologists:

I greet the participants in the Soviet-American TV conference-leading scientists who have devoted their lives to combatting cancer.

The global significance of the problem is obvious. There are no countries in the world today that would be free of this grave disease. And its toll, regrettably, is not shrinking.

A considerable part of the specialists in oncology is concentrated in our two countries. They have already done much in studying the causes and mechanisms of development of malignant tumors and in evolving methods for preventing and treating them. Certain results have been achieved, as evidenced by the millions of people saved.

But the enemy is far from routed, is not retreating and is threatening everybody, and the fight with it calls for vigorous and concerted action.

At Soviet-U.S. talks, including those at summit level, and at various multilateral forums we have given unfailing attention to promoting international cooperation in the fields of medicine and public health. This is exceptionally important and essential nowadays.

And, of course, the faster the process of real disarmament will be moving, the more funds we shall have for solving both national and global problems, including those of eradicating cancer and other baleful diseases.

Let me wish those taking part in the TV conference and through them all Soviet and American medical workers good and fruitful cooperation in the interest of sound health for Soviet and American citizens, in the interest of all humans.

Journalist Examines U.S.-Published GLASNOST

PM290909 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 23 Mar 88 p 14

[Report by own correspondent Iona Andronov: "Pawns in Someone Else's Game. 'Glasnost' From the Orchestra of Subversion"]

[Text] New York—In an ordinary building on 30th Street in New York there is a very extraordinary institution whose windows have iron bars on the outside. As for what kind of establishment there is inside, there is no plate on the wall at the entrance to the building, there is no sign in the lobby, and there is no name, address, or telephone number even in the most detailed city directory.

Nevertheless, having sought out the building on 30th Street at the suggestion of a journalist colleague, I rang the front doorbell, poked my correspondent's identity card through the crack that appeared as the door opened slightly, and I was admitted first to the lobby and then into a large room in semidarkness with an office desk and piles of papers on shelves. I introduced myself to a young-looking American, Lisenne Fogel [name as published], who at first reacted nervously to the appearance of a Moscow newspaperman, but she did not drive the unexpected visitor away, agreeing instead to give the representative of the press a few minutes of her time.

"I am told," I said to Fogel, "that your organization has been in existence for over 2 years now and is called the 'Center for Democracy.' But why, in the name of democracy and glasnost, is your center not listed in the freely available directories?"

"Aren't we in them?" she smiled a woman's arch smile.

"But at least you will not deny, will you, that for the past 18 months you have been publishing a magazine with a Russian title. What does it look like, incidentally?"

She stopped smiling and reluctantly showed me two copies of the magazine called GLASNOST, printed in English. As is known, this Russian word is exceedingly popular in the United States at the moment together with the word 'perestroyka.' But they have both been called a fraud in the pages of the New York magazine GLASNOST: The magazine maliciously slanders Soviet power, attributing to it brutal violence against all 'dissidents.' Pseudo-glasnost particularly extols a dozen or so of the most overt anti-Soviets who are now, to applause from the magazine, "struggling for the independence of Armenia." The magazine also heaps praise on a handful of nationalists in the Soviet Baltic republics.

Lisenne Fogel was candid:

"The items in our magazine are orginally in Russian and are put together by Sergey Grigoryants, a Muscovite, whom we have supplied with a U.S. computer with printing facilities. Grigoryants distributes some of the texts himself and sends copies to the Paris editorial office of the emigre newspaper RUSSKAYA MYSL, then it all comes to us."

"Is it illegal to carry it to Paris?"

"That is a confidential matter. I think I've said too much."

"Hardly. Because Grigoryants, according to the U.S. papers, has now publicly announced his main orientation toward the United States. Last summer THE NEW YORK TIMES published an admission by Grigoryants that he had been offered U.S. 'financial backing.' Then, in the fall, the Moscow correspondent of THE NEW YORK TIMES, without beating around the bush, numbered Grigoryants among the 'Western-orientated dissidents' and added that even 'dissidents' see the person who puts together your magazine as 'more interested in attracting attention abroad than in changes at home.' He got what he wanted when, in February, he made a quick flight to Yerevan and, by telephone, assiduously supplied all your leading press organs with nightmarish cock-and bull stories about 28 aircraft allegedly landing in Yerevan with punitive forces on board, some of whom allegedly made ready at the city stadium to be let loose on the people of Yerevan. No doubt you will reward the mischief-maker by inviting him to come and settle here? Has this already been agreed on?"

"We sympathize with him and will continue to help."

"Who is 'we,' exactly?"

In reply Fogel handed me a piece of paper listing 21 trustees of the "center" with "adviser" status. She enunciated very clearly the names of a Washington senator, an influential congressman, and a major journalist-cum-"Sovietologist," but she left out the name Michael Ledeen. I asked her to explain this, but she looked away, and said:

"I don't know who Mr Ledeen is."

"Incredible! You don't know one of your own trustees?"

"That's right, I don't know him."

That's doubly incredible, since his name has not been out of the newspapers over the past five years. He is often mentioned on television in the most scandalous news items on espionage and international intrigues. He was publicly exposed by U.S. Congress as the behind-the-scenes mediator in your government's deal with Israel on secret supplies of U.S. weapons to Iran. He had earlier been found guilty of inspiring anti-Soviet propaganda over the sensational attempts on the pope's life. The press has repeatedly stated that Ledeen has worked for the CIA for a long time. Did you not know that either?"

"No, I didn't!"

"The question that occurs to one is: Is your center supported by the intelligence services?"

"Not at all."

"Excuse me, but..."

A local journalist, Kevin Coogan, gave me a more detailed and authentic account of the secrets of the New York publishers of the pseudo-GLASNOST. He had earlier excited my curiosity by giving the lowdown on the new anti-Soviet magazine and securing semisecret information about it. Coogan's collaborator in this was Ketrina Vandel-Khevel [name as published], who works on the liberal weekly NATION. Their joint article for NATION is already in the galley proof stage. But Coogan agreed to share his information with LITERATURNAYA GAZETA:

"The center on 30th Street that publishes GLASNOST has a leadership of directors and advisers who are all cold war hawks. They are dominated by the special services stooges, such as, for example, Michael Ledeen, a leading U.S. specialist in subversive disinformation. The center's directors, Robert Pikus and Filip Sigelman [names as published], together with center adviser Herbert Ellison, are also members of the James Madison

Foundation, whose president, my knowledgeable colleagues told me, have links with camouflaged branches of the CIA and the British intelligence service, MI6."

"What are these people actually up to?"

"Recently we managed to see a document about the establishment of the center and its aims: 'To gather military, technological, and strategic information on the USSR, ascertain the state of garrisons of Soviet forces abroad, determine Soviet military resources in the economic sphere, and observe the actions of Soviet state security bodies.'"

"In what way?"

"By using 'couriers' masquerading as tourists and by recruiting Soviet citizens whom the document calls 'sources of intelligence information.'"

"Who pays for this?"

"The center has received $325,000 from representatives of our authorites over the past 2 years."

"How much to publish GLASNOST magazine?"

"The first sum allocated for the publication of GLASNOST that I know of was $15,000 last year, how much since then has yet to be discovered."

"What is the purpose of the magazine?"

"Its publishers have stated in print that one of their 'paramount' tasks is to gather information on ideological disagreements and the mood of various nationalities in the Soviet population"...

On 2 March THE NEW YORK TIMES reported without any kind of camouflage that the U.S. Government has empowered CIA Deputy Director Robert Gates, a leading intelligence expert on the Soviet Union, to carry out a careful analysis of the "demonstration in Armenia." In this connection the CIA deputy director has already announced that he is worried most of all by the following fact:

"Gorbachev intends to improve the Soviet economy, generally boost the people's political energy and make Soviet diplomacy more dynamic to create stronger competition with us, and all this will soon pose an unprecedented challenge to the United States."

Last fall the CIA deliberately divulged in the press its analysis of the Soviet policy of restructuring and potential methods of sabotaging it. It was proposed, in particular, to concentrate on "contradictory impulses in the USSR by different nationalities," zeroing in on the possibility of "serious internal trouble." They started advertising these base methods on 15 September, and only five days later the New York press published an article that had been smuggled in, an article by the Moscow manufacturer of GLASNOST, Grigoryants, who had been given the job of provoking the flare-up of a conflict situation.

So they suddenly set about stirring and whipping up the Nagorno-Karabakh problem from distant New York. With his patrons' approval Grigoryants also set about the Georgians, inventing the "forcible Azerbaijanization of the Georgian population." In addition, his New York mentors dream of stirring up trouble inside Georgia: "There is an Adzhar autonomous Soviet republic there, but there is not even an Adzhar people, formally speaking." They also set the Mingrelian Georgians, along with Soviet people of other nationalities, against the Russians: "Mingrelians, Latvians, and Jews were too heavily involved in Stalin's terror."

Chauvinist agitation for the partitioning of any country is severely punished by state law everywhere, including the United States. Propaganda of enmity and hatred among the peoples of our country is a serious crime under USSR law. But the New York anti-Soviets' stooges have already committed a double crime: They have switched from words to deeds.

Four months ago a U.S. congressional commission presented Latvian-born separatist Rolands Silaraups with a platform for anti-Soviet appeals to readers in the republic. The day before, in New York, at a street rally attended by similar turncoats, he had threatened to stir up the inhabitants of Riga from the United States. Prior to that—last summer—Silaraups had appeared before U.S. journalists working in Moscow in Grigoryants' apartment and boasted about preparations for illegal sorties in Riga by a grouping of chauvinists. Then the conspirator was driven out of our country. He is now being used by U.S. broadcasts to the Baltic republics for the purpose of inspiring aggressive nationalism.

On 3 July last year, at Grigoryants' apartment in Moscow, U.S. correspondents received the first magazine edition of the bogus GLASNOST and acquainted themselves with Mustafa Dzhamilev, leader of the Crimean Tatar extremists. Three weeks later his accomplices organized a street meeting near Red Square. They were incited, as it was put in an official USSR Foreign Ministry announcement, by the first secretary at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. And from New York the publishers of GLASNOST started to disseminate a propaganda pamphlet calling for maximum support for the nationalist Dzhamilev.

Nationalists—the pawns of foreign anti-Soviets—are essentially indifferent to the fates of Armenians, Georgians, Azerbaijanis, Latvians, Crimean Tatars, and even more so the inhabitants of little Nagorno-Karabakh. But today they are also trying to make Nagorno-Karabakh a bargaining chip in the global game played by certain U.S. politickers.

China

Wu Xueqian Encouraged by Detente Trend

PM241543 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Mar 88 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Minister on Detente"]

[Text] Concluding his visit to Britain, PRC Foreign Minister Wu Xueqian addressed a farewell reception he had arranged at the PRC Embassy, XINHUA states.

Touching on the international situation, Wu Xueqian stressed: "There is an encouraging trend toward detente in the development of the international situation but, at the same time, there are also complex factors causing people concern. Consistent efforts by all peace-loving countries and peoples in the world are still needed if there is to be real international detente," the minister noted. "As permanent members of the UN Security Council, China and Britain carry a noble responsibility for preserving peace and stability throughout the world."

TASS Reports Chinese Air Force Upgrade

LD291239 Moscow TASS in English 1203 GMT 29 Mar 88

[Text] Beijing March 29 TASS—The Chinese Air Force can operate at long distances, launch surprise strikes and ensure reliable anti-aircraft defence, XINHUA news agency has reported quoting Van Hai, commander of the Chinese Air Force.

Today, he said, the Chinese Air Force is rated third in the world by the number of aircraft. Although their technical standard is not up to the latest requirements, those types of aircraft which are produced in the People's Republic of China are continually modernized. Aircraft designers pay special attention to the development of high-speed fighters which have high flight ceiling.

Onboard weapons systems, electronic equipment, interference-resistant radar systems, ground-to-air and air-to-air missiles, and also command systems of the Chinese Air Force have undergone modernization lately. According to Van Hai, the Chinese Air Force downed 99 and damaged 134 intruder aircraft over the period between early 50s and late 60s.

Alekseyev Discusses 'Objective Need' for Summit

OW270612 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 23 Mar 88

[Alekseyev commentary from "World Today" program]

[Text] Dear listeners, you may have learned the contents of Soviet leader Gorbachev's reply to the letter from the middle school students in Mianyang City, Sichuan. Let us remind you that in his reply, Comrade Gorbachev expressed the belief that Chinese young people of this generation, who may be called the generation of the 21st century, will continue to uphold the noble cause of strengthening Sino-Soviet friendship. In this connection, Alekseyev, an observer of this station, writes:

The Soviet people are greatly interested in further developing their friendship with China. We always believe that the rapid development of Soviet-Chinese cooperation in various fields is in line with the objective needs of our two countries at the present stage, and that the same fundamental interests and ideals shared by Soviet and Chinese peoples are the foundation of this cooperation. For example, it was pointed out at the 27th CPSU Congress that there is great potential for Soviet-Chinese cooperation. This is because the most valuable things cherished by our two peoples, namely socialism and peace, are inseparable.

The Soviet people cannot help but feel very satisfied with the improvements that have occurred in Soviet-Chinese relations in recent years. Is it not self-evident that over the past 5 years Soviet-Chinese commodity trade has increased tenfold?

It is also worthy of note that in the important field of economic cooperation, the USSR will help China build and rebuild 24 large industrial enterprises. For example, those enterprises, which were built with Soviet assistance during the fifties, will be rebuilt; and among the new industrial projects to be built with Soviet assistance are three thermopower stations and a large open mine. The Soviet people are also pleased to note that our two countries hold identical or similar views toward a series of most important international issues. We highly treasure the fact that China endorses the results achieved by last December's Soviet-U.S. summit, especially the signing of the agreement on the destruction of intermediate- and short-range missiles.

Needless to say, however, there are still unresolved problems in Soviet-Chinese relations. (?This is why we should) take more positive steps to place dialogue between our two countries' on the agenda. As Gorbachev emphasized last January while answering questions raised by a reporter of the Chinese weekly, LIAOWANG, a Soviet-Chinese summit should become a logical development of such dialogue. By all indications, both sides feel the objective need of such a meeting. We are convinced that mutual accommodation will help us find a solution acceptable to both sides.

Northeast Asia

KCNA Reports SR-71 Violates DPRK Airspace

LD291332 Moscow TASS in English 1311 GMT 29 Mar 88

[Text] Pyongyang March 29 TASS—A U.S. SR-71 reconnaissance plane today crossed into the air space of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea east of the city of Kosong on the coast of the Sea of Japan, KCNA news agency reported.

The spy plane engaged in aerial espionage, flying as far as the city of Tanchon in Hamgyong-Namdo Province.

The intrusion into North Korea's air space was the 12th since the start of U.S.-South Korean military maneuvers codenamed "Team Spirit-88".

South Korean Navy Violates DPRK Waters
LD301010 Moscow TASS in English 0845 GMT 30 Mar 88

[Text] Pyongyang March 30 TASS—South Korea perpetrated another provocation against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on March 29 when its naval ship crossed into the territorial waters of this country in the Yellow sea, the newspaper NODONG SINMUN reported today.

After the appearance of a guard boat of the North Korean Navy, the trespasser ship "turned and fled", the paper said.

It added that the latest sortie by the South Korean military was a premeditated action directed at aggravating the situation in the region.

The United States and South Korean authorities, NODONG SINMUN stressed, must immediately stop these reckless intrigues.

'Team Spirit' Maneuvers Raise Tensions in Korea
OW290921 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2215 GMT 28 Mar 88

[Vsevolod Solovyev commentary, from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Currently the joint U.S.-South Korean "Team Spirit-88" military maneuvers are being held in the south of the Korean peninsula. Here is our commentary:

[Solovyev] Hello comrades. These maneuvers, codenamed "Team Spirit," are being held for the 13th time and for the 13th consecutive year. And every time Washington and Seoul explain the need for holding the maneuvers by alleging the supposed danger of an attack by North Korea against South Korea. This year the need to guarantee the security of the coming summer Olympic games was also cited.

During the current maneuvers, which will be held in conditions very closely resembling real combat, more than 200,000 officers and men, including more than 60,000 U.S. servicemen, will take part. Landing and offensive operations in a northward direction are being practiced and the use of a nuclear strike is being simulated. Particular attention is paid to cooperation between the units and staffs of the troops of both countries as well as to the movement of U.S. troops from the United States and a number of countries in the Pacific Ocean region to South Korea.

Only with extremely great imagination can such maneuvers be called a preparation for defense, yet this is precisely what the Pentagon is calling them. Obviously, in Pyongyang these maneuvers are being assessed as a rehearsal for aggression and as a direct challenge to the sovereignty of the DPRK.

Pyongyang is countering the provocative course taken by Washington and Seoul with a consistent peace-loving policy. Recently it made a number of proposals to South Korea and the United States, including ending the arms race and arms reduction, concluding a peace treaty between the DPRK and the United States, formulating a declaration on nonaggression between the North and South, turning the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone, and finally convening a joint North-South conference.

However, all these proposals made by Pyongyang have been ignored by Washington, and of course by Seoul. After all, the United States and South Korea see the maneuvers as a reliable means to maintain tensions in the region and a necessary step in the scheme to establish a new military alliance in the Far East under U.S. patronage in which the United States, Japan, and South Korea will participate. Instead of a policy of peace, they follow a policy of provocation and aggression.

Concern Voiced at Japanese Military Programs
PM241633 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Mar 88 First Edition p 3

[TASS correspondent V. Golovnin article: "'Defensive' Aircraft Carrier. Why Is Japan's Defense Expenditure Rising So Rapidly"]

[Text] Tokyo—How would you define the difference between a "defensive" and an "offensive" aircraft carrier when both carry on their decks combat aircraft and helicopters capable of delivering missile and bomb strikes? It has become evident that the Japanese Government has an exhaustive answer to this question, the TASS correspondent in Japan reports for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

People there intend to attach a "defensive" label to future aircraft carriers for their own armed forces which, as Tokyo has repeatedly declared, are categorically forbidden to possess such long-range offensive arms. In view of this, it is necessary to transform an elephant into a fly and to present a mighty ocean-going ship with supersonic aircraft on board as something akin to an innocent coastguard cutter.

In the course of parliamentary debates in mid-March, opposition spokesmen demanded from the government confirmation that Tokyo would continue to adhere at least officially to the principle of "passive defense" since the country created a long time ago its own armed forces in breach of the constitutional prohibition. The world situation has changed drastically since the signing of the

treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, and the long-awaited trend toward a "new detente" has emerged, Communist and Socialist Party deputies said. This being so, should Tokyo not also march in step with the times and cut back its military programs, developed in expectation of the toughest confrontation in the Far East?

It became clear that the Japanese Government has no such intentions. There will be no changes in military plans, despite all the promising positive changes in Soviet-U.S. relations, Prime Minister Noboru Takeshita unambiguously declared. Moreover, Tokyo is increasingly openly talking about the notorious need for "compensation" which, they claim, should make up the losses resulting from the destruction of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, including those in Asia. And the Japanese leaders prefer to forget that, until quite recently, they had claimed that a buildup of forces was necessary to "neutralize the threat posed by Soviet SS-20 missiles in the Far East." Now this class of arms is being totally deleted from the military balance tables.

What is at issue? A further 5.2 percent increase in military expenditure in fiscal 1988. Even though Japan is already far ahead of most NATO countries in terms of the rate at which these appropriations are rising, let alone the Pacific region. Many people here were shocked by recently published comparison tables. Japan's military budget, despite its "peaceful" constitution and all kinds of "official limits" on the buildup of "defense potential," is three times greater than the total armed forces appropriations in all six neighboring states belonging to ASEAN—Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, Singapore, the Philippines, and Brunei.

Tokyo is furiously preparing to "take over control" of international sea straits in the Far East and the thousands of miles of communications zone in the Northwest Pacific. It is for this purpose that the latest combat aircraft are being purchased, and modern ships are being built which, according to that same logic of transforming an elephant into a fly, are being modestly described as "patrol ships." Tanker aircraft are being purchased in order to increase the Air Force's operational range. It has been decided to build a powerful over-the-horizon radar system whose purpose would be to "listen to" the entire Northwest Pacific. It is in this context that they are already talking about the development [sozdaniye] of their own—"defensive" of course—aircraft carriers after 1991. Shuichiro Higashiyama, chief of staff of the Japanese Navy, recently declared that "this will enable us to think bigger...."

Tokyo is trying with equal zeal to shoot down the notorious "peacemaking illusions" which, in its opinion, have developed within the U.S. Administration. You cannot be "taken in by disarmament." Whatever happens, the strategic situation of confrontation in the world will not change, Japanese conservatives openly declare. Not only are they talking, they are also doing everything possible to keep the United States firmly along the lines of military confrontation. This is precisely why Tokyo, on its own initiative, pushed Washington into talks on the relocation of an additional contingent of U.S. forces in Japan in the event of "exceptional circumstances." The issue also concerns the stationing of major strategic dumps, tanks, and other U.S. combat equipment here to supply the notorious "rapid deployment forces."

Why does Tokyo need this? To judge by everything, people there still assume that the situation of East-West confrontation which has become customary makes it easier to build their relations with countries in the region, primarily the developing states, and simpler to ensure an "indulgent" U.S. attitude toward Japanese economic expansion. Moreover, Tokyo is not all that pleased with the prospect of even partial "demilitarization" of the U.S. economy, which would enable the United States to operate more successfully in the protracted competition with its Far East "ally." It was no accident that a few days ago the newspaper ASAHI expressed alarm because the voices of those who consider that Japan poses a much more serious threat to U.S. positions in the world than the Soviets can be heard increasingly loudly in the United States....

Former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, who is extremely well versed in international affairs, forecast in a recent article that by the end of the century Tokyo will undoubtedly have bolstered its mighty economic potential with the status of a mighty military power with all the ensuing consequences.

"We must be clearly aware of what we have in mind when demanding a sharp increase in military expenditure in Tokyo," Richard Armitage, U.S. assistant secretary of defense, recently declared with unexpected alarm. "Equipping Japan with nuclear weapons and offensive potential? I do not think that this would strengthen security in East Asia."

Near East & South Asia

Chemical Troops Chief Pikalov Visits Syria

Meets With General

JN241626 Damascus SANA in Arabic 1530 GMT 24 Mar 88

[Text] Damascus, 24 Mar (SANA)—General Hasan Turkumani, deputy chief of staff of the Army and Armed Forces, received here today General Pikalov, chief of the Soviet Chemical Troops, and his delegation. Talks during the meeting dealt with bilateral relations and ways to promote them, particularly with regard to boosting the Syrian Armed Forces' combat ability in confronting the imperialist-Zionist aggression against the Arab nation. Talks also dealt with the friendly Soviet Union's support for Syria in its just militant stands.

Sees Army Commander

JN232116 Damascus Television Service in Arabic 1730 GMT 23 Mar 88

[Text] Comrade Muhammad Ibrahim al-'Ali, commander of the Popular Army, this morning received General Pikalov, chief of the Soviet Chemical Troops, and his accompanying delegation. During the meeting, Comrade Muhammad Ibrahim al-'Ali presented a detailed explanation on the development of the Popular Army throughout the past 25 years of the revolution, the situation of this Army, and its development under the historic leadership of struggler leader Hafiz al- Asad.

Gen Pikalov affirmed the importance of reinforcing and strengthening relations between the two friendly countries in all fields under the wise Syrian and Soviet leadership.

Amman Islamic Conference Proceedings Reported

PM291355 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Mar 88 Morning Edition p 6

[Dispatch by special correspondent V. Skosyrev under the rubric "Islamic Conference Organization Sessions in Amman": "Dull Echo of the Uprising"]

[Text] Amman—Jordan has recently begun to play an increasingly prominent role in Arab affairs and in political efforts aimed at settling the crisis in the Near East. An Arab summit conference was held in Amman last year. And now we have another important event: Islamic Conference Organization (ICO) sessions are being held in the Jordanian capital at the foreign minister level.

A banner which reads "Jordan—a Country of Peace and Concord" has been hung not far from the Palace of Sport where the sessions are being held. The organizers of the meeting evidently would like the conference to be held under this slogan. Have these hopes been justified? So far the main sensation has been the arrival of an Iranian delegation led by M. Tashkiri, head of a department in the Ministry for Islamic Guidance. Iran boycotted the previous ICO summit session. Perhaps its return to the organization signifies a softening of its stand in the endless war with Iraq? Journalists here are trying to guess.

It is already clear, however, that the "Islamic community" has not succeeded in reconciling the warring sides. The difficulties became obvious during the very first conversation between correspondents and the head of the Iranian delegation. He said that Security Council Resolution 598, which calls for an end to the war, "came close but not close enough to understanding the reality of the situation." As we can see from Tashkiri's statement, Iran still wants Iraq to be named the aggressor and to pay war reparations.

Let me remind you that Iraq rejects these conditions and has said that it fully accepts Resolution 598 and is ready to cease fire on the basis of its provisions.

The contradictions between Iran and the majority of Arab countries supporting Iraq flared up with new force during the session traditionally held in camera. Journalists were informed that two draft resolutions were submitted at the session. One urged Tehran to agree to a cease-fire in line with the Security Council resolution, as Iraq has done. The second draft proposed approving Saudi Arabia's measures to guarantee safety during the "haj", when Muslims make a pilgrimage to the holy places in Mecca and Medina. Last year the "haj" was clouded by clashes between the Saudi forces there to protect public order and Iranian pilgrims. At least 400 people were killed. This year the Saudi authorities intend to introduce restrictions on pilgrims entering the country.

Tashkiri described both drafts as unjust and ostentatiously walked out of the session in protest.

A different atmosphere prevailed during the discussion of the Palestinian problem, which basically occupied the primary place on the agenda. Amman and the West Bank of the Jordan are divided by just a few dozen kilometers, and so the echo of the tragedy which is being played out in the Israeli-occupied territories could not fail to reach inside the walls of the session hall. The tone of the discussion was set by King Husayn of Jordan, who opened the session. He emphasized that convening an international conference on the Near East with the involvement of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council and all the sides involved in the conflict, including the PLO, is a means of achieving a just peace.

At the end of the discussion, the ministers appealed to the world community to support the Palestinians in every way possible.

As at other major international forums, a large proportion of the work is being done behind the scenes. Moreover, according to N. Murad, a Jordanian journalist, various rival groups sometimes use the conference to get into the public eye and even to attain official status. Someone called Mir Khamza [name as published], the envoy of one of the Afghan opposition associations in Pakistan, engaged in exactly this kind of lobbyist activity.

So what exactly were the demands made by this representative of the "mujahidin"? He rejected the national reconciliation policy and the Afghan-Pakistani Geneva talks and demanded the formation in Afghanistan of a transitional government composed entirely of elements hostile to the legitimate Afghan Government.

The militant hard line taken by Afghan antigovernment forces is not only contrary to the aspirations of the Afghan people but is also at variance with the stand taken by many Muslim states. This is what King Husayn said in his opening speech: "We appeal to our brothers in Afghanistan to achieve national reconciliation and to show no hesitation in this respect now, when the Soviet Union has announced its wish to withdraw its troops from Afghanistan. We very much hope that our brothers will not miss this opportunity."

And, finally, let us note one more characteristic feature. Afghanistan was not represented in Amman. But the Republic conveyed the point of its policy to the participants in the meeting. In an open letter, Afghan Foreign Minister 'A. Wakil said that Afghanistan is displaying a flexible approach and a willingness to compromise in the interests of peace at the Geneva talks.

Afghan Rebel Groups Receive New Missiles
LD301218 Moscow TASS in English 1110 GMT 30 Mar 88

[Text] Moscow March 29 TASS—TASS commentator Maksim Knyazkov writes:

An alarming news was transmitted by AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE today. According to the information that the news agency's correspondent received from diplomats and representatives of the Afghan opposition in the Pakistani cities of Islamabad and Peshawar, the groups that continue the armed struggle against the Afghan government are now being supplied with Milan anti-tank missiles.

A first consignment of some 140 missiles has already been brought into camps of opposition forces situated in the Pakistani territory. Members of anti-government units are trained in the use of these formidable weapons. As a result of this, according to AFP information, Milan missiles can be used in operations in a week or two.

Who is behind the deliveries of these lethal weapons? It is yet difficult to give the answer.

Milan missiles are an outcome of Franco-West German military cooperation but, as AFP emphasizes particularly, the weapons have not been brought from France. Then whence do they come from? From the FRG? But Milan missiles are manufactured on licence also in Great Britain and in a number of other countries have have been adopted for service by the armies of 37 countries.

In other words, a concrete source of the deliveries is not yet certain. Yet it is difficult to believe that such a scopeful operation which has just been started, is implemented without the knowledge of the main producers of these missiles.

The timing for large-scale deliveries of "Milan" missiles to the Afghan opposition also deserves to be noted. The Soviet Union proclaimed its readiness to withdraw its troops from Afghanistan after appropriate agreements are concluded at the Afghan-Pakistani talks now underway in Geneva through the mediation of the personal representative of the U.N. secretary general. Among other things, these agreements envisage international guarantees of non-interference in internal affairs of the Republic of Afghanistan. The Geneva agreements will close the road for outside aid to those in Afghanistan who hope to impose their will on the whole people by force.

And now Franco-West German missiles are being delivered in the atmosphere when a large-scale programme of the U.S. military aid to the Afghan opposition is to be curtailed. These missile deliveries will undoubtedly lead to the escalation of the conflict.

Does this mean that the United States partners in NATO intend, in the case of need, to supersede Washington in its anti-Afghan subversive activity?

Profile of Afghan Rebel Leader Cited
PM291113 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Mar 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed report under the rubric "The Press Bears Witness": "Payment for Split"]

[Text] The French weekly LE POINT publishes a note on the appointment of Gulbuddin Hikmatyar to the post of head of the "Islamic Alliance of the Mujahidin of Afghanistan" ("Alliance of Seven").

It notes that this man is tireless in reminding people of his primitive anti-Americanism. His movement has received up to 40 percent of U.S. aid to the Afghans. The majority of his commanders sometimes attack the fighters of other factions, in particular the soldiers of the "Panjshir Lion," Mas'ud. Or they plunder Western charity organizations' transport convoys.

His party, Hezb-e Eslami, created 12 years ago with the aid of the Pakistanis, has become the most integrationist force of the "Alliance of Seven." Thanks to his ties to the Pakistani Army, Gulbuddin Hikmatyar was able to obtain, in 1986, the first U.S. Stinger missiles, which changed the nature of the war in Afghanistan.

"The paradoxes of Hikmatyar are in reality utterly consistent," LE POINT writes. "His entire strategy from the start of the war has consisted in occupying positions to take power alone."

"Hikmatyar's appointment is catastrophic for the future of the resistance," an Afghan representative living in Paris says for his party. "We are moving toward a break in the alliance between the uncompromising and the moderates. We are now paying the price for our splits."

Henceforth, the weekly concludes, for a section of the Afghan resistance the enemy is no longer the person beyond "the firing line," as Jean-Paul Sartre wrote, but the person hiding behind the banner of Islam.

Najibullah Election Appeal to Afghan People

LD281952 Moscow TASS in English 1912 GMT 28 Mar 88

[Text] Kabul March 28 TASS—President Najibullah of Afghanistan has appealed to the people of the Republic on the occasion of the forthcoming elections to the National Council, BAKHTAR news agency reported today.

Afghanistan was on the eve of a major political event, he said. On these spring days, the Afghan people would for the first time in their history hold truly democratic elections to the country's supreme legislative body, the National Council of the Republic.

The victory of democratic, liberal ideas was filling with pride the heart of each patriot. Democratic traditions had been intrinsic in Afghan revolution that they were further developed. National reconciliation became a noble cause of people's government, he said.

The West was continuing arms deliveries to sow death and destruction on Afghan soil, Najibullah said. Nonetheless, the country's true patriots were courageously working to create coalition bodies of government with a view to establishing peace.

The Afghan people's peace initiatives were fully reflected in the new constitution. In keeping with the fundamental law, direct, equitable elections would be held nationwide on the basis of the secret vote, Najibullah said.

These elections were an accomplishment of the policy of national reconciliation, of a new political course. They attested to the implementation of basic principles of the new political system—the multi-party and coalition principles which reflected the interests of all classes, sections and groups of Afghan society.

President Najibullah called on all Afghans to take part in the elections and cast their votes in the name of their motherland.

The president also appealed to the opposition leaders. "Once again we appeal to you," he said. "Think about Afghanistan which has been suffering from war for nine years. It is your task to take part in running the country's affairs. Our people's government has already offered you ministerial posts and other high positions.

The government put forward the idea of national reconciliation and is pressing for establishing peace in accordance with the demands of the entire nation," Najibullah said.

"Earlier on," he went on to say, "we advanced numerous constructive proposals and are now ready in the name of peace to make more steps in that direction.

"In connection with the forthcoming elections to the National Council we are prepared to consider your proposals on forming a coalition government.

"Don't pass up this historic chance.

"Some of you have already chosen peace. Don't side with those who nurture sinister designs with regard to our country. We vote for peace and happiness of the much-suffering Afghan people."

The National Front and the Council of Ministers of Afghanistan also appealed to compatriots abroad in connection with the scheduled elections to the National Council.

"The policy of national reconciliation has removed all obstacles in the way of peace on our land. We urge you to return home. The doors are open for you," the appeal said.

Last year, it observed, more than 120,000 people returned home despite all the obstacles. The state provided the returnees with jobs, housing and food and granted them the right to participate in the coalition government and local bodies of government.

People of call-up age were granted deferment of military service. Civil servants and servicemen were guaranteed their former jobs.

The appeal called on the compatriots to work jointly towards establishing a peaceful, fair life and taking a most active part in the country's public life.

Afghan Left-Wing Alliance Publishes Platform

PM291029 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Mar 88 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Afghanistan: Platform of Alliance of Left-Wing Parties"]

[Text] Kabul, 27 Mar—The BAKHTAR agency has published the provisions of the platform of the Alliance of Left-Wing Democratic Parties of the Republic of Afghanistan.

According to this document, the Alliance will carry out its activity on the basis of full equality for all members and their organizational independence. The main tasks include the defense of the country's independence, national sovereignty, and territorial integrity, the struggle to end the fratricidal war, the creation of favorable conditions for Afghan refugees to return home, the

democratization of the political system of the Republic of Afghanistan, and the struggle against the attempts of the reaction and imperialism to interfere in the country's internal affairs.

In the domestic policy sphere, the Alliance is taking part in the system of coalition rule, is struggling for the assured political alliance and unity of actions of all the country's national-democratic progressive forces and for the fundamental solution of the nationalities question and the insuring of the all-round development of all ethnic groups inhabiting Afghanistan with a consideration for their national and historical features, and is waging a struggle against all manifestations of chauvinism and nationalism.

The Alliance is struggling for the improvement of the people's living conditions, the development and consolidation of the state sector, and the encouragement of private capital investments with a view to developing the country's economy and eliminating backwardness.

In the foreign policy sphere, the Alliance sees its task in consolidating the positions of the Republic of Afghanistan in the international arena, expresses its adherence to the nonaligned movement and respect for the UN Charter, and supports the peoples struggling against colonialism, neocolonialism, imperialism and reaction, Zionism, fascism, and apartheid, and for independence. The Alliance advocates the ending of the arms race and disarmament and the development of friendly relations with all countries of the world.

The PDPA, the Revolutionary Organization of Working People of Afghanistan, and the Organization of Working People of Afghanistan have approved this program, the BAKHTAR agency reports.

The Alliance's supreme organ is the consultative council, which includes three representatives from the leadership of each party. The fulfillment of all decisions made is compulsory for all members of the alliance.

Artifical Border Issue Raised at Geneva Talks

PM281553 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Mar 88 Morning Edition p 5

[IZVESTIYA Press Service report: "Artificial Obstacle"]

[Text] At the Afghan-Pakistani talks in Geneva, Diego Cordovez, the UN secretary general's personal representative, has recently been confronted with the "wall" which Pakistan and the United States are trying to erect in the way of a settlement of the situation around Afghanistan. It is a question of the so-called "Durand Line": Washington and Islamabad would like to "legitimate" it as the official border between Pakistan and Afghanistan.

Let us recall that the aforementioned "line," named for Sir Mortimer Durand, representative of the British crown in India, was imposed by Britain on the Afghan emir in 1893. For approximately 600 km the border was drawn at the time in a region settled by Pushtun mountain tribes who in fact had never before obeyed any central authority and who controlled strategically important trans-Asian routes, including the Khyber, Gumal, and Boland Passes. As a result of that demarcation, the Pushtuns of the plain and the mountains ended up on different sides of the "Durand Line."

Since then not one Afghan regime has recognized the "Durand Line" as the official border between Afghanistan and Pakistan. And not a single modern Afghan figure nor a single Pushtun (there are roughly 12 million Pushtuns in Pakistan, and approximately 8 million in Afghanistan) will agree to such recognition.

This is eloquently attested by statements by leaders and religious authorities of Pushtun tribes. Maulawi Sir Azam, chairman of the Bajawar Regional Ulemas Council, recently declared in an interview on Afghan television and radio that Pakistan is taking a rash step by raising the question of the "Durand Line." He emphasized that the Pushtuns have never recognized it and never will. The mawlawi urged all Pushtuns to actively resist the Pakistani authorities' attempts to interfere in the affairs of free tribes and declared that all tribes support Kabul's initiatives for a peace settlement.

Maulawi Habibullah from the Mohmand Region said in turn: "Everyone can see now that the Pakistani authorities are really interested in further fanning the undeclared war and are advancing more and more new conditions at the Geneva talks, particularly the totally unrealistic demand for the 'Durand Line' to be recognized as the border. They intend to divide free tribes by force and 'fan still further the flames of civil war.'" Similar statements have been made by the well-known Pushtun leaders Malek Wali Khan Kukikhel, Malek Muhammad 'Azim Khan, and Malek Muhammad Gol.

The border question, which does not even appear on the agenda of the Geneva talks, can be discussed in earnest only after the normalization of Afghan-Pakistani relations, when a certain level of mutual trust has been reached between the sides. By insisting now on recognition of the "Durand Line" as the border, Pakistan can achieve just one thing. And this is that all the Pushtuns living both in Afghanistan and in Pakistan will act as a united front with weapon in hand against Islamabad's hostile forces which are seeking to divide them.

Petrovskiy Attends Bangladesh Reception

LD282232 Moscow TASS in English 2118 GMT 28 Mar 88

[Text] Moscow March 28 TASS—Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the People's Republic of Bangladesh in the Soviet Union Karim Mir Muhammad Rezaul held on Monday reception on the occasion of the National Day of the Republic, the Independence Day.

Present at the reception were Vice President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Valentina Shevchenko, Deputy Foreign Minister of the USSR Vladimir Petrovskiy, heads of diplomatic missions, other officials.

Along with the Bengal people, the Soviet people are marking with profound satisfaction Bangladesh's holiday, said V. Petrovskiy in an interview to TASS correspondent Igor Agabekov. It is desirable to see the friendly relations between the two countries further developing. The new thinking is now winning ever new positions in the international scene, gaining a deeper inroad also in South East Asian countries. We hope that the two countries will strengthen coordination of their actions in questions of war and peace at different international forums.

I have been attending to the duties of ambassador of Bangladesh in your country for only one year and a half, said Karim Mir Muhammad Rezaul, and I can say with confidence that I am lucky indeed: I am witnessing the second revolution in the USSR, the revolution which is gaining strength with every passing day. Wherever I find myself in your country I always feel profound respect to my country and my people. It is my duty to promote the development of the friendly relations between our countries and I want these relations be broader and deeper, the ambassador underlined.

East Europe

Jakes Notes CPCZ Leading Restructuring

PM291459 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "M. Jakes Speech"]

[Text] The CPCZ is leading the restructuring now under way in the country's political, economic, and social life, M. Jakes, CPCZ Central Committee general secretary, told a party conference of Communists of the CSSR State Planning Commission.

The reorganization of central organs, the clear demarcation of their competence, and the removal of duplication and excessive administration in their activity are an important integral part of the restructuring of the economic mechanism in line with the CPCZ Central Committee December (1987) Plenum decisions. The changes being prepared will reduce the number of ministries and other central organs, change their structure and forms and methods of work, and cut the number of leading officials.

Resolute implementation of structural changes in the production and technical base and its modernization and reorganization presupposes a deeper involvement of the Czechoslovak economy in the international division of labor by means of specialization, production sharing, and cooperation with the USSR and with the other socialist countries.

Given this, the State Planning Commission must become the strategic center for socioeconomic development. The existing forms and methods of planning no longer meet the requirement to switch the national economy over to intensive development. The restructuring of the economy is thus linked to the restructuring of the whole planning system. This is a necessary condition for the transition from administrative management methods to the use of economic levers and is one of the key problems of restructuring.

However, it should be stressed, M. Jakes pointed out, that the CPCZ sees the planned management of the economy as one of the gains and advantages of socialism and the chief instrument for the implementation of socioeconomic policy. All the successes in building a socialist society, developing the economy, and enhancing working people's living standards are linked to it.

The extensive changes in society also make increased demands on party work. The party must serve as the political guarantor and chief motive force of these revolutionary changes. For this it must improve the style and methods of its activity and create a situation favorable to the comprehensive restructuring and deepening of socialist democracy, the CPCZ Central Committee general secretary stressed in conclusion.

BCP Decision on Reporting of Corruption

PM281008 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Mar 88 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent L. Zhmyrev report under the rubric "From the Socialist Countries: The Fraternal Parties' Life": "The Right to Criticism"]

[Text] The profession of a journalist is difficult and responsible, noble and humane. It has always met with respect and support from the party, says a decision published the other day by the BCP Central Control-Auditing Commission in connection with a series of critical articles in the Bulgarian newspaper TRUD under the general heading "Corruption in Power."

However, glasnost should be extended on the basis of objectivity, principles, and constructive aspirations. The results of an investigation on the basis of the articles showed that the facts cited are not in accordance with reality and are presented tendentiously. In this connection a decision was adopted to revoke penalties against a number of persons touched on in the publications. Various penalties were imposed on those who took part in preparing the articles for the press.

The right to criticism and glasnost are not only words. Many examples could be cited where on the basis of articles in RABOTNICHESKO DELO, TRUD, and other mass media important decisions have been taken by the top party and state organs. However, participation by journalism in the struggle for democracy and glasnost in the course of the revolutionary restructuring of society

is incompatible with defamation, the absolutization of negative phenomena, the distortion of the picture of our life, and the creation of an atmosphere of skepticism and pessimism, and still more with disinformation and slander.

The decisions of the BCP Central Control-Auditing Commission do not restrict the rights of the mass media to criticism and glasnost, the document goes on to say. Quite the contrary. The party has always supported the desire of workers in the press, radio, and television to give the public broad information about everything that is happening in the country, to criticize, and to combat negative phenomena.

Demichev Awards Bulgarian Embassy Official

LD191246 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 19 Mar 88

[Text] An Order of People's Friendship was presented in the Kremlin today to (Marin Yot), an adviser to the ambassador in the Bulgarian Embassy in the USSR. Comrade Demichev congratulated the Bulgarian representative on receiving this award, saying that he deserved it for his work aimed at friendship and cooperation between the peoples of the two coutnries.

Jaruzelski Receives Academician Arbatov

LD190007 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1955 GMT 18 Mar 88

[Text] Warsaw, 17 Mar (TASS)—Wojciech Jaruzelski, PZPR Central Committee first secretary and PPR State Council chairman, today received Academician Georgiy Arbatov, Director of the Institute of the United States and Canada, who is in the PPR within the framework of an exchange of experience between the CPSU and the PZPR on key international problems.

Taking part in the meeting were Jozef Czyrek, Politburo member and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, and Vladimir Brobikov, USSR ambassador to the PPR.

Poland's Malinowski on 'Vital Period of Change'

PM241107 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 20 Mar 88 p 3

[S. Pomerantsev interview with Roman Malinowski, chairman of the United Peasant Party Supreme Committee and Polish Sejm marshal, under the heading "Thinking of the People's Welfare"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The 10th United Peasant Party (ZSL) Congress begins work in Warsaw tomorrow. On the eve of the congress Roman Malinowski, chairman of the ZSL Supreme Committee and Polish Sejm marshal, answered questions for SELSKAYA ZHIZN in an interview with S. Pomerantsev, our correspondent in Poland.

[Pomerantsev] Four years have passed since the previous, Ninth ZSL Congress. What has been done to implement its decisions? What have you not managed to do?

[Malinowski] It has been a very vital period of positive change throughout Poland and within our peasant party. We set ourselves worthy. difficult tasks in the program documents of the ninth congress. As a whole they led our party out of the narrow circle of questions concerned purely with rural life and agriculture and onto the broad highway of general Polish problems—those being experienced by the whole country, all the people.

The main aims of our activity have been to increase party members' real contribution to drawing up a program and implementing the processes of socialist renewal, establishing national concord, developing democracy, particularly different forms of self-management, and implementing political and economic reforms. During the realization of these aims the ZSL has gained greater authority and importance in the coalition system of power, and collaboration in real action between the ZSL and the PZPR—which plays the leading role in our coalition—has become more broad and more real, as has our collaboration with the Democratic Party and the social forces united with the Patriotic Movement for National Rebirth (PRON). One indicator that the ZSL's authority has increased is the fact that we have gained 121,000 new members in the last 4 years and so our party now has a total of 513,000 members. During this period the processes of ideological integration between party members have deepened and our members have become more active politically and socially and exert a greater influence on rural life. To an increasing extent we are becoming a party of today, a party of action, whose share of the responsibility for everything happening in Poland is constantly growing.

Apart from the ZSL's qualitative and quantitative development, I consider one of the most important results of the intercongress period to be the fact that we have overcome crisis phenomena in agriculture more quickly than has been achieved in other sectors of the economy, and progress in agrarian production has been considerably greater than in the provision of consumer goods, one of the reasons for this being that the joint ZSL-PZPR agrarian policy has brought the human factor into play. We have achieved a positive balance of foreign trade in food products, and the dynamics of food exports have reached their highest level for years. I should point out in this respect that just 7-8 years ago our annual negative balance of trade in food products with other countries was hovering in the region of $2 billion.

Considerable progress has been achieved in the development of various forms of democracy, which, apart from anything else, are changing the system of election to the Sejm and local councils, offer broader opportunities for

territorial and cooperative self-management, and have established new institutions, such as civil rights representatives, a constitutional tribunal, and various consultative councils.

The activity—rooted in long-standing Polish rural traditions—of social councils under rural starostas [head of rural administrative unit], cooperative self-management, the Peasants' Union, which protects the professional interests of rural workers, and various agricultural circles and organizations is becoming increasingly effective. Even this brief list shows that there have been a considerable number of positive results which are opening up favorable prospects. But this certainly does not mean that we are completely satisfied with the results achieved so far in the implementation of our decisions.

The serious economic crisis from which we are only just emerging and the need to reorient people's way of thinking and their civic activeness show that the dynamics of change are not satisfactory in every sphere. The problems still to be solved include the slow pace at which industrial production is being reoriented to meet agricultural needs, difficulties with maintaining a sound balance of peasant income, insufficient activeness on the part of some organs of self-management, and the excessively slow progress in removing the differences between city and countryside regarding access to culture, education, public health care, and all the benefits of civilization.

[Pomerantsev] Could you please talk about the nature of the changes taking place in Polish agrarian policy and the role and tasks of ZSL members in this process.

[Malinowski] Our agrarian policy was announced in 1983 at the 11th plenum of the PZPR Central Committee and the ZSL Supreme Committee and was confirmed and developed at the 9th ZSL Congress and the 10th PZPR Congress. The Polish agrarian sector, which is mainly based on family farms, has reached the level of productivity where it needs considerably more substantial assistance in the form of industrial technical means and production equipment if it is to make further appreciable progress. Consequently, one of the main areas of our activity, which we approved at the joint 11th plenum of the PZPR Central Committee and the ZSL Supreme Committee, is to increase the output of industrial products geared to meet the needs of agriculture. This process is moving very slowly, however. Progress in this direction is being helped by the allocation of considerable funds for the development of enterprises producing goods for agriculture and the food industry, and also for land reclamation and the provision of water resources for rural areas. It is a question of speeding up the achievement of total self-sufficiency in food products—which is our aim—by securing support from other sectors of the economy for the efforts made by agricultural workers.

One important change has been the process of production specialization affecting private farms and those in the public sector. This is being helped by concentrating land in economically strong farms. In the second stage of the economic reform we are refusing to subsidize the production of certain types of foods and, by changing prices, subsidies to consumers are also being terminated to create better economic conditions for those who produce the goods.

[Pomerantsev] How have the preparations gone for the congress? On which problems will this congress be focusing its attention?

[Malinowski] The congress has been preceded by a great amount of political discussion at report and election meetings in 32,241 ZSL circles, at 2,320 conventions in gmina organizations and corresponding organizations, and at 49 voivodship conventions. A total of 1,020 delegates have been elected to the party congress, 48.6 percent of whom are directly involved in agricultural work.

The report and election campaign revealed the far-reaching unity of opinions of ZSL members regarding the main problems of the country as a whole, rural areas, and agrarian production. During the discussions and in the approved documents the delegates expressed their determination to contribute to realizing and expanding the current process of sociopolitical and economic reforms, deepening cooperation with the PZPR and PRON, and strengthening Poland's positions in the international arena and the policy of peace and disarmament conducted by the Soviet Union.

Demands to improve the profitability of agrarian output and rural areas' supply of production means and equipment manufactured by industry and to increase investment in land reclamation and water supply projects and the development of the agricultural processing sector predominated during the discussion of rural and agricultural problems. Attention was drawn to the need for a diversified approach to the economic needs of rural areas and the social, spiritual, and cultural needs of people employed in agriculture.

ZSL members reaffirmed their principled stand on the defense of peace and the development of all-around cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist community countries in the interests of Poland's security and the security of all mankind.

[Pomerantsev] You recently proposed holding a meeting in the Polish capital for the chairmen of CSCE member-countries' parliaments to discuss questions of further developing the process begun in Helsinki. What prompted this initiative and what do you regard as the main aim and significance of such a forum?

[Malinowski] The Sejm's initiative springs from the need to strengthen collaboration between parliaments in the "Europeanization of Europe." A meeting of the chairmen of the Warsaw Pact parliaments was held in Warsaw in July last year, which supported this initiative. It was decided to hold these forums annually, in each country in turn. We plan to hold the meeting in Berlin this year. Definite norms of contact have been laid down. While showing full respect for sovereignty, it is proposed to establish an institution which will provide the European Parliament with the opportunity to participate. A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation led by Comrade L.N. Tolkunov took active part in the Warsaw meeting.

Our efforts in this direction coincide with attempts to achieve increasingly fruitful rapprochement between the main international economic organizations in Europe—the EEC and CEMA. The preconditions now exist for cooperation between socialist countries and the Council of Europe, which was discussed in Warsaw at a meeting with Marcelino Oreja, the general secretary of that organization.

The meeting in Warsaw between the chairmen of the European, U.S., and Canadian parliaments will pursue similar aims. A date has already been set—the second half of November. Our proposals on these matters have met with a positive response in Western Europe and the United States.

The aim of this meeting is as follows: To look boldly and frankly to a common European future while proceeding from our common European heritage and respecting current differences and divergences of views. Our development is becoming increasingly interdependent, which is causing the formation of a pan-European self-awareness parallel to national and state self-awareness not only in the field of reducing the means of intimidation and creating the means for cooperation—which aim is fully served by the Washington meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan and the decisions made at this meeting, preparations for the next such meeting in Moscow, and the W. Jaruzelski Plan—but also in the field of economic, technological, ecological, scientific and technical, and cultural cooperation and the exchange of people and information.

Strengthening pan-European cooperation at parliamentary level is a good contribution to the processes whose aim is to solve problems affecting the whole of our continent from the Atlantic to the Urals. Being part of Europe must be synonymous with belonging to a sphere where common sense and all-around cooperation prevail, thereby setting the whole world an example of the possibility and necessity of new thinking on human destiny.

PZPR Delegation Visits USSR 21-25 March

PM290943 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Mar 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] In accordance with the plan for interparty ties between the CPSU and the PZPR, a delegation headed by B. Kedziej, chief of the PZPR Central Committee Science, Education, and Scientific and Technical Progress Department was in the Soviet Union 21 through 25 March and acquainted itself with CPSU experience in improving activity in the sphere of education and science in the light of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress.

The Polish comrades had meetings and conversations at the CPSU Central Committee Science and Educational Establishments Department, a number of ministries and departments, and the USSR Academy of Sciences.

PZPR Visitors Study Party Leadership of Media

PM300913 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 88 Second Edition p4

[TASS report under general heading: "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] A delegation of PZPR ideological workers led by S. Tabkowski, PZPR Central Committee member and head of the PZPR Central Committee Propaganda Department, was in the Soviet Union 20-26 March at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, where it was acquainted with CPSU experience in leadership of the mass media.

The delegation had meetings and conversations at the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, the Kiev Gorkom, the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, and the editorial offices of a number of party publications.

MSZMP Plenum Report Describes Discussions

PM301425 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Mar 88 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "MSZMP Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Budapest, 25 Mar—An information report has been published here on the MSZMP Central Committee Plenum held 23-24 March and chaired by J. Kadar, MSZMP general secretary. It examined questions of the party's leading role and the improvement of the work of the system of political institutions, and the results of the party organizations' discussion of topical tasks of ideological activity and the proposal to convene a national party conference.

The report says that party organizations' discussion of the MSZMP Central Committee theses on the party's leading role and the improvement of the system of

political institutions had illustrated Communists' responsibility and their readiness for action and had considerably enriched the accumulated experience. The successful continuation of socialist building sets the task of further developing the party's leading role and the system of political institutions in accordance with the new demands.

The MSZMP Central Committee decided to convene the national party conference 20 May this year. The draft resolution submitted for examination by the party conference will be published and discussed by party members. The MSZMP Central Committee called upon the country's mass and public organizations to examine the draft resolution and voice their opinion.

The information report points out that the discussion held in party organizations on topical tasks of ideological activity was useful. It was noted at the same time that ideological uncertainty can be observed within the party on certain important questions, which will lead to weakened political and organizational unity in the party ranks. In this connection conditions for carrying out scientific research in the sphere of the social sciences and creative debate must be improved, and the main priorities and promising aims of socialist building at the given stage of development determined. The results of the discussion must be used in the party conference document and in practical activity.

Hungarian Writer on Renewal of Socialism

PM301015 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Mar 88 Second Edition p 4

[Hungarian writer Sandor Fekete article under the rubric "Forum for Foreign Writer": "Chief Guarantee"]

[Text] Budapest—I was the guest of PRAVDA 35 years ago as one of the editors of the main party newspaper SZABAD NEP (now NEPSZABADSAG). Now, as I write for PRAVDA, I can hardly hope that those who received me will remember a 26-year-old Hungarian journalist and I cannot count on Soviet newspaper readers knowing my name. Don't therefore think me immodest if I talk about myself to begin with: Then maybe the meaning of my article will be more comprehensible.

I was born 10 years after the October Revolution in a small Hungarian village in a house roofed with rushes. My father was a worker and an underground Communist. While still a boy I learned the truth from my father that the landowning capitalist regime under which we lived was unjust and must be overthrown. In 1947 when I was a student and "young veteran" in the antifascist Resistance I proclaimed, full of confidence: The old world has indeed been destroyed. Everything else depends on us alone...

But it was not only dependent on us. This rapidly became clear. The servile sectarian policy practiced by Matyas Rakosi's group led the country into disaster. I did not reproach socialism, but I opposed the distortions of the ideas of the October Revolution. I dissociated myself at the same time from those members of the former party opposition who left for the West after the Hungarian tragedy of 1956. I wrote the following in December 1956 in response to the emigre "ex-Communists," who wanted the "disintegration of the Soviet regime" and then the creation of some "bourgeois democracy": "Have the Soviet people made sacrifices only now to pursue the 'splendors' of bourgeois democracy? No, my hopes are associated not with this, I want to live to see the internal renewal of the Soviet Union."

My hopes were reinforced by the fact that in 1956 N.S. Khrushchev managed to fend off the conservatives' attacks, but the new era which began with the 20th CPSU Congress proved too short and socialist society was once again seen to be ossified. Even profound respect for Lenin could not compel me to forget that the bold, revolutionary, innovative spirit, which was the most important element in the ideas of the leader of the socialist revolution, were gradually disappearing in the state created by Great October. Lenin's brilliant capacity for self-knowledge and self-correction, which is so rare even among revolutionaries, was being lost. He did not lose his self-possession in the labyrinth of reality, knew the people's opinion, and if practice did not match up to his theses he was able to revise them.

During the time of increasingly obvious stagnation, certain Italian Communists claimed that the October Revolution had lost its momentum. They did not in fact receive a convincing answer for such accusations cannot be effectively refuted by words but only by actions and deeds. A stubborn man like myself who does not want to resign himself to the fact that the idea guiding his life has been calumniated and who—on the other hand—was unable to join the worshipers of the capitalist order of the golden calf could console himself with two things: First, joy that life in Hungary, my native land, was being renewed increasingly perceptibly and that most of the people had increased confidence in socialism; second, I relied on the fact that the real revolution would itself prevail over its own distortions, with the knowledge from history that every revolution advances slowly, sometimes with relapses after turbulent periods.

After all this maybe I should not say what hopes the turnaround in Soviet policy, especially M.S. Gorbachev's speech in January 1987 and then his report at the ceremonial session in honor of the 70th anniversary of Great October, evoked in me. Finally, the unfolding extensive restructuring and glasnost confirm in deeds that the vigor of October has not been exhausted.

This restructuring was also very opportune for us Hungarians. In the mid-1980's it became clear that the former rates, programs, and methods of renewal were

inadequate. Bad mechanisms were partially disconnected, but the new democratic ones had still not had the requisite influence on political and economic life. Furthermore, economic development slowed down and then essentially stopped owing to the oft-mentioned and notorious "unfavorable trends in the world economy" and also largely owing to our own mistakes. The state's foreign debt and the rise in inflation indicate substantial shortcomings in the production structure.

I do not know whether the opponents of the reforms had prepared themselves—for we also have such people in Hungary—to undermine them, but the fact is indisputable that if they did have such intentions then the powerful breakthrough of Soviet restructuring fundamentally debunked such attempts. Middle-level functionaries in our country also tried to proclaim: "We weren't born yesterday, we have nothing to learn from other people." Nothing, of course, can be copied without taking into consideration specific national conditions. But it is extremely useful—and it is in our national interests—to learn from the experience of the radical program of Soviet restructuring and rely on its achievements.

People in our party apparatus and grass roots party links have realized this, as have the progressive intelligentsia and the masses of workers and peasants. I will even say the following: Since the 20th CPSU Congress people in our country have never before shown such sincere, broad sympathy for events in the Soviet Union.

The incumbent Soviet leadership has not only verbally proclaimed a return to Leninism but also knows from its own experience that structures inclined to stagnation must be restructured in a revolutionary manner. The resolute cadre changes under way are the guarantee of further development. The Soviet press, which has never since the time of Lenin been so alive and full of determination and militancy to castigate dogmatism, stagnation, and moral decay, is also, incidentally, a guarantee of this. Those of my colleagues who previously mainly kept up with articles in THE TIMES or LE MONDE now "fight" to quickly obtain the latest editions of Soviet publications or an account of their articles in our press.

It is understandable that restructuring does not evoke the same reaction in everyone. For instance, there are still sectarians and leftists in Hungary. They are afraid that the radical reform being implemented will lead to the failure of socialism. Those supporters of the Horthy regime still living and also the supporters of Western democracy are relying on precisely such an outcome. But from our 32 years' experience we have learned that you must not forget to secure your rear on the path to greater freedom, greater democracy, and greater socialism. Those who use socialist democracy irresponsibly must be dealt a resolute rebuff, and conscious antisocialists must especially be exposed.

This year will be tense in our country from the viewpoint of the implementation of the Hungarian reform and all socialist building in the country. We can expect an intensification of the struggle against various opposition tendencies in the ideological sphere and in politics. It is especially important for the reform worked out by the party not to be synonymous with a reduction in the standard of living in the minds of those strata of the population who will experience more than others the difficulties of economic stabilization, so that the tie between the party and the people is not breached. If we are hoping for the best today, Soviet restructuring, which has opened up a new historical perspective for socialism in the ideological, political, and economic context, is the chief guarantee of this.

Tisch-Led Union Delegation Meets AUCCTU

AU222020 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND in German 19-20 Mar 88 p 1

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—A meeting of the secretariats of the GDR's FDGB and the All-Union Central Council of Soviet Trade Unions started in Moscow on Friday [18 March]. The delegations are headed by Harry Tisch and Stepan Shalayev, the chairmen of the two federations. The 2-day exchange of opinions focuses on the topical tasks of the GDR and USSR trade unions in implementing the decisions of the 11th SED Congress and the 27th CPSU Congress. In addition, the perfection of the cooperation between the trade union federations of the two countries is discussed.

In the morning the FDGB National Executive Council delegation visited the Moscow ENIMS Production Union for Cutting Machine Tools. With its 8,000 employees, the union is the USSR's leading institute for flexible production systems, robots, program-controlled machine tools, and high-precision machine tools, as well as for new metalworking processes. As its director general, Professor Dr Vasiliy Belov, explained, the institution has had close contacts for more than 2 decades with the research center of GDR machine tool construction in the Karl-Marx-Stadt "Fritz Heckert" Machine Tool Combine, with which direct contacts were established recently. In a tour of the enterprise and in talks with working people, Harry Tisch and the other members of the delegation informed themselves about the activities of the production collectives and the work of the trade union committees to solve economic, social, and educational tasks.

Unions Conclude Talks

LD191605 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1445 GMT 19 Mar 88

[Text] Moscow, 19 Mar (ADN)—The deliberations by the secretariats of the National Executive Council of the FDGB and the Central Council of the Soviet Trade Unions [AUCCTU] were concluded today in Moscow. The delegations were led by the chairman of the two federations, Harry Tisch and Stepan Shalayev. In the

2-day exchange of opinions and experience, the tasks of the trades unions of the GDR and the USSR in the fulfillment of the resolutions of the 11th SED Party Congress and the 27th CPSU Party Congress were discussed, along with issues of the perfection of cooperation between the two countries' trade union federations.

During the discussion, the great significance of collaboration between the trade unions of the two countries in the process of integration, cooperation and specialization of production was stressed, within the framework of CEMA as well as the successful development of their bilateral relations on the basis of the agreement concluded between the FDGB and the AUCCTU on the further shaping of their cooperation.

The FDGB and AUCCTU representatives stressed the efforts of the WFTU and toward the strengthening of its influence in the international trade union movement. In the international sphere, they assessed the strengthening of socialism, the avoidance of the danger of a nuclear catastrophe, and the securing of peace as the most important tasks of trade unions.

Talks Detailed

PM251131 Moscow TRUD in Russian 22 Mar 88 p 3

[Unattributed report under the "International Trade Union Movement" rubric: "In An Atmosphere of Mutual Understanding"]

[Text] A meeting took place in Moscow's Palace of Labor 17-19 March 1988 between the secretariats of the AUCCTU and the Central Board of the Free German Trade Union Federation [FDGB] on the theme "Topical questions of the activity and tasks of the USSR and GDR trade unions at the present stage of socialist building." The Soviet trade union delegation at the meeting was headed by S.A. Shalayev, AUCCTU chairman, while the GDR delegation was headed by H. Tisch, FDGB Central Board chairman.

During the meeting there was a comprehensive exchange of the work experience of the two countries' trade unions in the modern conditions of socialist building.

The AUCCTU representatives described the Soviet trade unions' participation in the work of implementing the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 18th USSR Trade Union Congress, restructuring all aspects of Soviet society's life, developing socialist democracy and glasnost, improving the management of the economy, and developing the social sphere at an accelerated rate. At the same time emphasis was placed on the growing role of trade unions in resolving the tasks connected with the transfer of the Soviet economy to new forms of management, the development of self-management and the expansion of labor collectives' powers, the restructuring of the work of trade unions themselves, and the broadening of democracy within trade unions.

The FDGB Central Board delegation reported on the trade unions' participation in the further building of a developed socialist society in the GDR, which is being implemented in accordance with the decisions of the 11th SED Congress and the 11th FDGB Congress. It stressed the multifaceted activity of trade unions in implementing the course aimed at unifying economic and social policy and the broad democratic participation of working people and trade unions in all spheres of social life.

The participants in the meeting exchanged opinions on questions of the international situation and stated unanimously that the consolidation of socialism, averting the danger of nuclear catastrophe, and safeguarding peace are the most important tasks facing trade unions. They emphasized the tremendous importance for all mankind of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles signed in Washington and welcomed the accord in principle to reduce by one-half the strategic offensive armaments of the USSR and the United States while ensuring strict observance of the ABM Treaty.

They rated highly the policy of the USSR and the other socialist countries aimed at arms limitation, disarmament, and international cooperation, as well as the socialist states' initiatives on the creation of nuclear-free corridors. The sides supported the GDR's important proposal on the holding of an international meeting on nuclear-free zones to be staged in the GDR capital, Berlin, in June 1988.

In the sides' opinion the Soviet Union's active moves toward a political settlement of the Afghan problem provide an important impetus for the improvement of the situation in that region. At the same time the participants in the meeting expressed concern at the delay in the Geneva talks on this problem which is the fault of Pakistan and the United States.

The two sides noted the great significance of cooperation between USSR and GDR trade unions in implementing the processes of integration, production sharing, and cooperation within the CEMA framework and emphasized the stable character and successful development of bilateral trade union ties on the basis of the agreement on the further development of cooperation signed by the AUCCTU and the FDGB Central Board.

At the same time, mention was made of the need to consistently improve the content of bilateral cooperation in the interests of resolving the common tasks facing trade unions in the USSR and the GDR.

The meeting demonstrated once more the common approach of the AUCCTU and the FDGB Central Board to the assessment of the main questions of present-day international relations and the situation in the world trade union movement. The meeting stressed the need to resolve all international problems by means of talks in

the spirit of the new political thinking. The AUCCTU and FDGB Central Board representatives confirmed the two trade union centers' desire to comprehensively promote the further intensification of the activity of WFTU and the strengthening of its prestige and influence in the international trade union movement.

During its stay in Moscow the FDGB Central Board delegation visited the experimental scientific research institute of metal-cutting machine tools science-and-production association and the "Parizhskaya Kommuna" factory belonging to the "Zarya" industrial-commercial footwear association, where they were acquainted with the practical work of the USSR's restructuring of economic management methods, the work of labor collectives in conditions of full economic accountability [khozraschet], self-financing, and self-capitalization, and with the active participation of trade union organizations in resolving economic, social, and educational tasks.

The sides noted with satisfaction that the results of the meeting and the effective exchange of opinions and experience will promote the further strengthening and raising of the level of cooperation between the two countries' trade unions and the intensification of their collaboration in resolving national economic tasks, and will make an undoubted contribution to the consolidation of the fraternal friendship between the working people and peoples of the Soviet Union and the GDR.

The meeting between the secretariats of the AUCCTU and the FDGB Central Board was held in an atmosphere of the trust, sincerity, and fraternal mutual understanding typical of relations between trade unions in the USSR and GDR.

Silayev, SFRY's Zemljaric Sign Program

PM280827 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Mar 88 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Signing of Long-Term Program"]

[Text] I.S. Silayev, USSR Council of Ministers deputy chairman, and J. Zemljaric, vice president of the SFRY Federal Executive Council, signed a Long-Term Program for Economic Cooperation Between the USSR and the SFRY for the Period Through the Year 2000 in Belgrade. Its implementation will facilitate more rational use of production capacities and material resources and the use of highly efficient equipment and technology in both countries' economies.

The program provides for the comprehensive development of production ties between Soviet and Yugoslav organizations and the improvement of the commodity turnover structure as a basis for stable long-term economic relations. The development of economic cooperation must be effected on the basis of equilibrium in the balance of payments relationship.

Particular attention will be paid to the following: the boosting of the technical standard and quality of reciprocally supplied output; rational use of economic potential, especially, machine building potential; the creation and introduction in production of new technological processes, machines, equipment, assemblies, and components conforming with world technical standards; the development of assembly and component specialization and coproduction, reciprocal deliveries of full sets of articles, and the rational division of production programs; and improvement of the production structure and of the structure of consumption of raw and semifinished materials, and the reduction of the energy- and materials-intensiveness of production based on the introduction of modern technological processes and also on the broad application of waste-free technologies.

Regarding food production the increased production of a wider range of high-quality goods, expanded specialization and coproduction, and increased reciprocal deliveries are envisaged. The forms of trade cooperation will include the opening of specialized stores.

Efforts will be channeled in the agro-industrial complex toward expanding cooperation in selection, genetics, the production and exchange of seeds and planting materials, and the development and exchange of highly efficient technologies and information.

Great importance is attached to the further development of cooperation in the sphere of capital construction, reconstruction, and modernization of industrial, power engineering, agro-industrial, touristic, and other projects.

Cooperation in transport will receive a new boost.

The sides will take the requisite steps to increase the exchange of tourists between the two countries and the exchange of experience and specialists.

Particular attention will be devoted to the establishment of direct production and scientific and technical ties between USSR and SFRY enterprises, associations, and organizations, the creation of joint enterprises, joint capital investments, and other forms of cooperation. If interest is displayed on both sides, USSR and SFRY organizations may set up joint enterprises on USSR territory and engage in joint capital investments in the SFRY in accordance with their countries' legislation.

The Soviet-Yugoslav Intergovernmental Committee for Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation will monitor the implementation of this program.

West Europe

Gorbachev, PCI's Natta Discuss Europe, Ties

Delegation Members Participate

LD291745 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 29 Mar 88

[Text] A meeting was held at the CPSU Central Committee today between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and

Alessandro Natta, secretary general of the Communist Party of Italy [PCI]. Taking part in the meeting were Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Napolitano and Rubbi, members of the leadership of the PCI; Zagladin and Chernyayev, members of the CPSU Central Committee; and Sandri, member of the PCI Central Committee.

In the nearly 6-hour-long conversation, some of the most important problems of modern times were discussed, connected with the destiny of Europe, the prospects for disarmament, the processes of restructuring in the USSR, and the role of communist and other democratic parties and their theoretical and political work and their cooperation.

There was also discussion of matters relating to settling regional conflicts. Satisfaction was expressed with the nature of the relations between the CPSU and the PCI—comradely, based on equality of rights, open [otkrytyy], deferential—that is, the sort of relations which there should be between communists and indeed all democratic forces.

Natta Interviewed on Talks

LD292039 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 29 Mar 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; interview with Alessandro Natta, secretary general of the Italian Communist party, by Soviet television correspondent Sergey Iyezuitov in Moscow; date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Iyezuitov] Comrade Natta, tell us your impressions of your meetings and talks in Moscow?

[Natta in Italian with superimposed Russian translation] My impressions are very good, I would even say marvelous. With Comrade Gorbachev I had a very lively, substantial, and interesting conversation. We discussed the most varied of themes, including the international situation, Italy, its problems, Soviet policy, restructuring, which is underway in the Soviet Union. I would say that we have done a great deal of useful work.

[Iyezuitov] You said that during your meetings the international situation was discussed. In this context, how do you assess Soviet foreign policy?

[Natta] We rate it highly. In recent years the Soviet Union has put forward a number of very important proposals which force people to take a fresh look at the reality of this world. And they have yielded their first fruits. But (?no one) can say that positive changes will take place by themselves. We should not think that the way ahead is a smooth road without obstacles, without difficulties, and I think we should support the policy which Comrade Gorbachev is conducting in order to overcome the difficulties.

Further on Discussions

LD292153 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1849 GMT 29 Mar 88

[Text] Moscow, 29 Mar (TASS)—A meeting took place in the CPSU Central Committee today between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Alessandro Natta, general Secretary of the Italian Communist Party [PCI]. A.N. Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; G. Napolitano and A. Rubbi, members of the PCI leadership; V.V. Zagladin and A.S. Chernyayev, members of the CPSU Central Committee; and R. Sandri, member of the PCI Central Committee, took part in the meeting.

Greeting one another, M.S. Gorbachev and A. Natta affirmed the importance of the regular friendly contacts which have now been established between the leadership of the two parties. This is necessary both for the parties themselves and also for the peoples and the countries they represent. This is of great importance for international development as a whole. The world has become both very dynamic and very complex, M.S. Gorbachev commented, and nobody and no single party on their own is capable of either grasping or raising all of the problems which have come on to the agenda. Hence the importance of interparty cooperation. Mutual satisfaction was expressed with the nature of relations between the CPSU and the PCI—comradely, equal, open, respectful; that is, such as they should be between communists and, indeed, between all democratic forces, too.

The major problems of the modern day were discussed in a conversation lasting nearly 6 hours. A. Natta presented a profound and original analysis of the processes taking place in Western Europe, laying particular stress upon the processes of integration. He described the ideas and potentials of the various political forces, which determine what social and other consequences these processes will have for the working people, and what effect they will have upon international relations.

He shared thoughts on the responsibility which lies with communists and other left-wing forces in this connection and analyzed the reasons why there has been a lag in reaching an understanding of the profound changes which had occurred in capitalist society over a compatively short period.

A. Natta spoke about his party's searching and its activity in the unusual and changing conditions of present-day Italy, about the working out of ideas for a democratic alternative taking account of past exerience, and about the significance of and the opportunities for cooperation between left-wing, democratic forces.

M.S. Gorbachev responded with interest to this courageous and realistic analysis of present-day capitalist society, which stimulates contemplation of the alternatives and the opportunities of a socialist option.

Particular attention was focused on problems of detente and cooperation in Europe between the countries of NATO and of the Warsaw Pact, of the EEC and of CEMA. The need to study all possibilities that existed here, taking account of the differences in the nature of the processes occurring in East and West Europe, was stressed. Here a respectful attitude to the positions and concepts on international questions of each state, proceeding from their own interests, is of importance.

The same applies to relations with neutral and nonaligned countries which belong to no grouping.

M.S. Gorbachev pointed out in this connection that we do not regard the processes of integration in Western Europe from a purely critical point of view; we see all aspects. Our fears relate only to the attempts to militarize these processes, something which carries the threat of a new spiral in the arms race.

Recognizing that the differences existing on the European continent in the positions of the two communities and of individual states are quite natural, the CPSU and PCI laid special stress upon the significance of the negotiations on the problems of reducing conventional weapons and armed forces, and of monitoring [kontrol] this process, which should have a positive influence upon the defense policy of the sides. M.S. Gorbachev described the results of the latest round of the Vienna meeting, pointing to certain positive improvements, which make it possible to count on practical results this very year.

M.S. Gorbachev and A. Natta advocated developing fruitful dialogue and more active cooperation in all spheres between East and West Europe, in setting out the common tasks which can be resolved in the "common European home" by joint efforts. With the aim of going deeper into these problems, the leaders of the CPSU and PCI agreed to set up a mixed research group, which will be open for other European political forces to take part.

The attitude of our party and country to Europe and to European problems, M.S. Gorbachev said, is determined by the fact that we consider ourselves first and foremost to be Europeans.

In speaking about a "common European home", we proceed from the fact that all the differences which have been objectively formed between individual countries or their groupings are preserved in this "home". But while we are aware of all these differences, we realize that the whole of Europe is linked by historical, cultural, economic, and scientific-technical factors. We are all bound by a common destiny.

It is precisely with a discussion of the whole sum of European problems in mind that we proposed to hold a "roundtable", M.S. Gorbachev recalled. Forces of different ideological orientation representing the whole political spectrum of Europe may take part in it. Points of view will be very varied, but it will be necessary to seek what is common among them and to work out compromises. This is a normal—more than that—necessary process. The holding of a "roundtable" could provide a serious boost to common European consideration of the continent's destiny and prospects.

At the request of the Italian comrades, M.S. Gorbachev provided a general review of the changes which have occurred in Soviet society during the period of restructuring and spoke about how the party has worked out the theory of restructuring and transformed its policy, and also about the development of the concept for which the slogan: "More socialism, more democracy" has become the symbol.

We drew conclusions from the past and concluded that the attempts at reform which were undertaken before failed because they were only half measures, partial, uncomprehensive, and did not envisage the active engagement of the masses. Now we are orienting ourselves to involve literally the whole of society in bringing about restructuring.

The processes of restructuring are growing. The people have raised their head. We are learning to live in the conditions of broadening democracy and glasnost. This sometimes gives rise to doubts with some people. Some people ask: But is not socialism being destroyed? But what socialism? If a dogmatic, bureaucratic socialism—then yes, it is being destroyed. But a creative socialism, a socialism founded upon genuine Leninist ideas, an order in which the deciding word belongs to the man of labor—that socialism is not being destroyed, on the contrary, it is developing.

Now we are seeing a strange picture: The internal opponents of restructuring and its external foes are seemingly closing ranks. Both are trying to sow doubts. But this does not disturb us. We are very much aware that we must go forward and only forward. The alternative to restructuring is stagnation, crisis, to say nothing of the destiny of socialism.

Our task consists in resolving the most difficult problems and bringing about the possibility of greater unification of society, not in dividing it. And we shall resolve all problems in a democratic way, in conjunction with the people. We shall act together with the working people. With the start of restructuring in our country the principle was laid down: We start everything from the party. The party understood the necessity for radical transformations, it set in train the policy of restructuring. We now know that it is dangerous to allow any lagging behind in the processes of social development.

And now, when restructuring is underway it is enough to drop back a little, to omit something, and confusion and muddle begin. We are also convinced of another thing: The party must not shrink from the most difficult issues, including those connected with our history, which not only for us, but also for the fraternal parties, has become the subject of ideological struggle.

M.S. Gorbachev dwelled on the plans connected with the upcoming 19th all-union party conference and stressed the role which it has to play in deepening the processes of restructuring, in the critical interpretation of what has been done and in correcting what has not proved itself worthwhile. The CPSU is fully determined to carry out the role of political vanguard of society, while functions of management and administration must be carried out by other bodies, primarily by the soviets. The soviets are a great creation of our revolution, of the people themselves, but new life needs to be breathed into them. At the conference we shall review thoroughly the issues of democratizing the whole of society and of democratization within the party.

A. Natta pointed out the lively interest and sincerely positive evaluation of the Italian comrades who are attentively following the efforts to renew Soviet society and the international policy of the USSR.

The further development of these efforts toward genuine democratization in all spheres, the PCI secretary general stressed, can make an important contribution in the new evolution of international relations. Therefore, these efforts are regarded positively not only by Italian communists, despite the specific nature of their experience and ideas, but also, in the view of the PCI, by wide circles of democratic forces throughout Europe.

Issues relating to resolving regional conflicts, primarily in the Near East, were discussed. M.S. Gorbachev stressed that having analyzed the history and dramatic experience of these conflicts, we came to the conclusion that they cannot be stopped by military means. What are needed are political methods. As concerns the Near East, we, like the majority of states, see the way out as lying in convening an international conference, within the framework of which the most diverse multilateral and bilateral negotiations can take place. However, a genuine settlement is unattainable without a just solution of the Palestinian problem and without the participation of representatives of the Palestinian people. Within the context of preparations for and conducting a conference, the way will be found to reestablish normal relations between the USSR and Israel.

We are ready to cooperate in a constructive way, including with the Americans. We are now thinking over the results of the conversations between E.A. Shevardnadze and G. Shultz on this issue.

The Afghan issue was touched upon. M.S. Gorbachev reported on the state of the Geneva negotiations, and declared the Soviet leadership's resolve to bring the matter to its conclusion.

In conclusion, M.S. Gorbachev and A. Natta expressed profound satisfaction with the dialogue which had been held, and with its content, atmosphere, and the spirit of mutual respect which characterized it. The intention to continue to develop it in a constructive manner was expressed.

M.S. Gorbachev asked for cordial greetings to be conveyed to Italian Communists and working people, and confirmed his intention to visit Italy. A. Natta expressed sincere wishes for the CPSU's success in implementing restructuring.

TASS Issues Correction

LD292255 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 2137 GMT on 29 March carries a "corrected retransmission" of the preceding item, published under the headline "Further on Discussions," correcting it as follows:

From end of first paragraph to paragraph nine, first sentence should read: ...in the meeting.

Mutual satisfaction was expressed with the nature of relations between the CPSU and the PCI—friendly, equal, open, respectful.

The major problems of the modern day were discussed in a conversation lasting nearly 6 hours. Particular attention was focused on problems of detente and cooperation in Europe between the countries of NATO and the Warsaw Pact, of the EEC and CEMA.

M.S. Gorbachev pointed out that we do not regard... (omitting several passages and changing "comradely" to "friendly" in third paragraph).

Paragraph eleven, first and second sentences should read: ...between East and West Europe. With the aim of going deeper... (omitting "in setting out the common tasks which can be resolved in the 'common European home' by joint efforts").

Comparison of Report on Talks

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 30 March carries in its Second Edition on pages 1-2 a TASS report on the Gorbachev-Natta meeting. The PRAVDA report, entitled "M.S. Gorbachev Meets A. Natta", has been compared with the TASS-corrected version cited above, revealing the following variations:

Paragraph one, sentence one reads in PRAVDA: ...a meeting took place at the CPSU Central Committee 29 March between M.S. Gorbachev... (omitting dateline and subbing "29 March" for "today");

Paragraph seventeen, sentence five through last sentence reads in PRAVDA: ...is not socialism collapsing [rushitsya]? But what socialism? If a dogmatic, bureaucratic socialism—then yes, it is collapsing. But a creative socialism, a socialism founded upon genuine Leninist ideas, an order in which the deciding word belongs to the man of labor—that socialism is not collapsing, on the contrary... (subbing "collapsing" for "being destroyed");

Paragraph twenty-three, last sentence reads in PRAVDA: ...the PCI, by broad strata and democratic forces throughout... (rephrasing).

Natta Gives News Conference

LD301109 Moscow TASS in English 1033 GMT 30 Mar 88

[Text] Moscow March 30 TASS—"In our opinion, a meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was interesting and positive from the point of view of openness of a method of comparing political views", Alessandro Natta, general secretary of the Italian Communist Party, has stated here. He spoke today at a press conference held at the Press Centre of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the results of his visit to the Soviet Union.

The leader of Italian Communists said that during the meeting in the Kremlin the main attention had been devoted to problems connected with detente and cooperation, specifically, the relations between EEC and CMEA. An assessment was given to regional conflicts in their interrelationship with the detente and disarmament process. According to Alessandro Natta, the exchange of views was held in the course of which the stands were specified in the relations between the Italian Communist Party and the CPSU: They are friendly, equitable, open and respectful.

Answering questions of journalists, Alessandro Natta pointed out that he had met and talked with Mikhail Gorbachev on many occasions. In his opinion, Gorbachev is a strong political personality capable of seeing a perspective, including a long one, to renew ideas and work out major projects. He is characterized by a good knowledge of concrete problems, respect for the stand of others and an ability to listen to other people and to conduct a dialogue.

Further on Remarks

LD301347 Moscow TASS in English 1334 GMT 30 Mar 88

[Text] Moscow March 30 TASS—A delegation of the Italian Communist Party was very much impressed by the work of the CPSU leadership for the democratization both of the party life and the life of the whole of Soviet society, Alessandro Natta, general secretary of the Italian Communist Party, has stated. He spoke today at a press conference held in the Press Centre of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The leader of Italian communists specially pointed out the resolve of the CPSU to play the part of a political vanguard of society on condition that managerial and administrative functions should be performed by other bodies, soviets in the first place.

Alessandro Natta welcomed the efforts of the USSR aimed at resolving the Afghan problem. He said that during his conversation with Mikhail Gorbachev the determination of the Soviet Union was expressed to withdraw troops from Afghanistan, to achieve the signing of an agreement at the Geneva talks and to ensure the settlement that would permit Afghanistan to be an independent and non-aligned country.

Italian communists display a lively interest in the process of detente and disarmament in Europe, of which the ensuring of security of the Mediterranean region is a component part. Alessandro Natta described the Mediterranean Sea as the lungs of Europe. He expressed high appreciation of the initiative of Mikhail Gorbachev put forward in Belgrade and pointed out that the freezing of the naval fleets, their subsequent reduction and withdrawal from the region were the starting point of the normalization of the situation there.

Touching upon the situation on Israeli-occupied Arab lands, Alessandro Natta reiterated solidarity of Italian communists with the struggle of the Palestinian people in defense of their lawful rights. Massive actions of Palestinians in the West Bank of the Jordan river and in the Gaza sector confirmed that Israel's policy had been deadlocked and that the Palestinian problem could not be resolved from the position of strength, he continued. The leader of Italian communists went on record in favour of the convocation of an international conference in which PLO, the only lawful representative of the Palestinian people, should by all means take part.

The reorganization policy (perestroyka) in the USSR, makes an impact on the activities of Western communist parties, Natta said. A question of a correspondent of the NEW CHINA NEWS AGENCY on prospects of the development of the world communist movement was answered by Giorgio Napoletano, member of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party, who also took part in the conference. He said that in the opinion of Italian communists, there were two component parts in Europe of which progressively-minded forces were made up. These are, first, the Communist Party and, second, socialist, social democratic and labour parties whose activities should be regarded as a single whole. Even today one has every reason to say that their views are

identical on such problems as international detente, disarmament, cooperation, and not only between the East and the West but also between the North and South.

Gromyko Presents Award

LD301352 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 30 Mar 88

[Text] In the Kremlin today Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko presented the Order of the October Revolution to Alessandro Natta. The secretary general of the Italian Communist Party merits the award for services to the struggle for social progress, peace and democracy, strengthening of friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Italy, and on the occasion of his 70th birthday. Comrade Gromyko and Alessandro Natta exchanged speeches.

Gromyko Praises Natta

LD301453 Moscow TASS in English 1430 GMT 30 Mar 88

[Text] Moscow March 30 TASS—The order of the October Revolution was presented to General Secretary of the Italian Communist Party Alessandro Natta in the Kremlin today by member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Andrey Gromyko. Alessandro Natta was awarded a high Soviet order for services in the struggle for social progress, peace and democracy, consolidation of friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Italy and in connection with the 70th birthday.

Speaking at the presentation of the award, Andrey Gromyko said that Alessandro Natta had a difficult and happy destiny of a fighter for the cause of the working people, the destiny linked inseparately with the activity of the Italian Communist Party. Andrey Gromyko noted, specifically, the great contribution of the leader of the Italian Communist Party to the deepening of relations between Soviet and Italian communists, between the two peoples. "The Italian communists' support for our course at perestroyka is highly appreciated in the Soviet Union," he went on.

Dwelling on yesterday's meeting between Alessandro Natta and Mikhail Gorbachev, Andrey Gromyko said that "the meeting offered an opportunity to discuss a whole range of fundamental questions of Soviet-Italian relations, the main problems of the present-day international and, especially, European politics". Both sides "showed a creative approach to the continuation of a constructive dialogue between the two parties in conditions of equality, respect and their complete independence".

Alessandro Natta warmly thanked the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet for a high award. He noted that he had been inspired for over 40 years by an unshakeable conviction about the justice and value of the ideals of the working people's liberation, and about the need for the struggle for the right of nations to freedom, democracy, socialism and peace."

"Over this period which saw several dramatic events, the struggle and transformations in the world, in Italy and the Soviet Union, I have been exerting efforts in the ranks of the Italian Communist Party to ensure durable relations of friendship, mutual understanding and cooperation between the peoples of the USSR and Italy, to develop the relations of cooperation between our two parties", Alessandro Natta said.

Natta Seen off by Dobrynin

LD301611 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 30 Mar 88

[Text] Alessandro Natta, general secretary of the Italian Communist Party, who is in Moscow at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, left today for home. Flying off to Rome with him were members of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party—Napolitano and Rubbi; Sandri, member of the Italian Communist Party Central Committee; and Foa, deputy chief editor of the UNITA newspaper.

The Italian comrades were seen off at the airport by Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Zagladin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chief of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee; and senior personnel of the CPSU Central Committee.

Thatcher Government Disarmament Stand Criticized

PM291331 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Mar 88 Second Edition p 4

[Special correspondent A. Lyutyy dispatch: "Echo of Brussels. Britain and Nuclear Disarmament"]

[Text] London, March—Half-jokingly, a local newspaper recently remarked that it is time to move British Government departments to Brussels, since the influence of the decisions adopted at the NATO and "Common Market" headquarters is so palpable in British politics today. But if you look at this problem from a different angle, it is impossible to miss London's desire to be increasingly active in making the political weather in Europe. This tendency, which is particularly clear under Margaret Thatcher's present Conservative government, was clearly manifested at the NATO summit meeting in early March.

Although it is already almost a month since the Brussels conference, the echo of its decisions is continuing to reverberate in the British Isles. The center of the debate has now shifted from a study of the points of the Brussels declaration to an analysis of the stand of Britain itself. Many people ask the question: What is the reason for the hardening of London's position in the sphere of nuclear

disarmament, and where is the mainspring of the braking mechanism which has been engaged to hinder movement toward a nuclear-free world?

The role of leader of the chorus of champions of nuclear "modernization" and "compensation"—a role which London assumed at the Brussels session—has been greeted without particular enthusiasm by the majority of the British. It has been given unconditional support probably only in the Tory camp itself. Michael Heseltine, former defense secretary in the Conservative cabinet, for example, writes enthusiastically in THE DAILY TELEGRAPH: "Britain has now gained a unique opportunity to influence the direction in which Europe will move. It has not had this opportunity under any previous prime minister, starting with Churchill."

It is possible to agree that London's voice is today heard far more loudly than just a few years ago. But the increased role also presupposes increased responsibility. The qualitatively new situation which has taken shape since the signing of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles demands new thinking free from the stereotypes and doctrines of the "cold war."

However, despite general declarations in favor of reducing nuclear arms, London has so far proved incapable of this. Thatcher is trying to use the certain confusion and political uncertainty in a number of NATO countries in order to take over the banner of the "flexible response" doctrine, which has started to split at the seams, and lead those who are hesitating. At a time when President Reagan is living out his last months in the White House, when Chancellor Kohl cannot ignore the situation in the government coalition and the opinion of his fellow citizens, and when French leaders are engaged considerably in election battles, Thatcher, according to THE WASHINGTON POST, would like to make Britain "the new center of the flexible response strategy."

On a practical plane this means not only a claim to the political leadership of NATO but also London's readiness to take the initiative in "compensating" for the nuclear weapon cuts envisaged by the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. This is a question of plans repeatedly discussed in the press to site up to 60 additional nuclear-armed F-111 fighter-bombers on British territory, to equip combat aircraft with new nuclear cruise missiles instead of free-fall nuclear bombs, and also to gird the country from the sea with nuclear cruise missiles on board warships and submarines.

The "nuclear modernization" formula whose introduction was persistently sought by Thatcher is missing from the Brussels declaration. Its place is taken by a more compromising thesis to the effect that the bloc's nuclear arms must "be maintained at the most modern level in case of need."

Some commentators here regarded this as a failure for the prime minister: She was demanding the modernization of the short-range nuclear means sited in the FRG, but the vagueness of the formula gives Chancellor Kohl certain freedom to maneuver on this question. Be that as it may, however, the government in London interprets the same formula in its own quite unambiguous way, namely as a direct sanction of the modernization of Britain's nuclear potential.

This approach has been criticized in opposition political circles. A recent session of the Labor Party leadership adopted a resolution which states: "We deplore the British Government's destructive behavior and its opinion that nuclear disarmament in Europe has gone too far. We condemn all attempts to fraudently circumvent the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles and the prospects for further nuclear disarmament in Europe. We particularly sharply condemn Thatcher's appeal to increase the number of U.S. F-111 nuclear bombers based in Britain and to station air- and sea-launched cruise missiles in Europe on the pretext of the so-called modernization of NATO's nuclear arsenal."

The Laborites are by no means alone. They have been supported by representatives of a number of other parties. "In conditions where NATO and the Warsaw Pact have the potential for destroying each other more than 50 times over, why does the prime minister want still more weapons? Is this really not enough?"—this question was put by Paddy Ashdown, member of Parliament for the Social and Liberal Democratic Party. David Owen, former foreign secretary and founder of the Social Democratic Party, supported in a speech the idea of creating in central Europe a corridor free from short-range nuclear weapons.

There is active discussion of this question here: Why is the Thatcher government so stubbornly opposed to talks on a "third zero"—the elimination of short-range nuclear means—toward which Bonn tends in principle? The most widespread opinion on this boils down to the following. The elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles removes one of the most important planks of NATO's "flexible response doctrine," which presupposes the gradual escalation of armed conflict right up to the use of various kinds of nuclear weapons. The removal of short-range nuclear means would completely undermine this doctrine and require its revision, to which Thatcher has a categorical objection. Eliminating such a nuclear "buffer" between NATO and the Warsaw Pact would virtually make Europe nuclear-free and bring the disarmament process directly up to the "independent" nuclear means of Britain and France. London or Paris would willy-nilly have to decide the question of their further fate. And it is precisely this that they do not want to do.

The British Government's intention to preserve its nuclear potential is not just lip service to Thatcher's dubious philosophy which calls nuclear weapons the

peacekeeper in Europe. The MORNING STAR revealed a curious facet of this problem. In the newspaper's opinion, Thatcher does not want to part with nuclear weapons because without them the country would descend to the status of a third-rate power. In addition, possession of nuclear weapons, some types of which are supplied to London and controlled by Washington, preserves the important bridge of the "special relationship" with the United States to which Britain clings so firmly. "Attempts to preserve the 'cold war' atmosphere and the arms race," the newspaper writes, "are necessary to keep British imperialism an important force in the imperialist alliance, second in terms of influence after the United States."

An egotistic, immoral stand having nothing in common with the true interests of the security and well-being of Britain itself. This is the opinion of many people in the British Isles. This too is precisely the view taken of this stand by the leadership of the Mass Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. It points out in recently adopted resolutions that the country's peace-loving forces, including the Labor Party's champions of a nuclear-free Europe, must use more assertive tactics.

The attempts made by Thatcher prior to the Brussels meeting and directly at it to secure at all costs the NATO bloc's unity on questions of military policy have not gone unnoticed here. However, the British premier set about sealing this unity not only with calls for "compensation" and "modernization" but also with anti-Soviet rhetoric. The NATO Council session was announced by Atlanticists as an important milestone in alliance history which presupposed not only the resolution of military questions but also the elaboration of the bloc's political line in response to a USSR course which arouses tremendous sympathy in the world. Commentators here have written that "the Gorbachev factor was an unseen presence in Brussels."

But just what was counterposed to the Soviet Union's political innovativeness? The same old intimidation with the "threat from the East." The Atlanticists are clearly badly off for arguments today if Thatcher has dredged up the tattered image of the "Russian bear" which, she says, is not to be trusted and is still not averse to "laying its paw" on Europe. We have here an obvious attempt to intensify still further the ideologization of NATO policy on an anti-Soviet basis. Here, in the British Isles, this is also manifested in the increasing tendentious, anti-Soviet aggressiveness of the mass media.

Certain experts believe that, for the sake of strengthening bloc unity on these bases, London has moved away from a whole number of previously held positions on disarmament issues which had elicited objections from Washington. The British Government, which only recently was vigorously advocating the elimination of chemical arms, has essentially slid toward the obstructionist U.S. stand on this question, justifying this by claiming that it is difficult to verify the removal of chemical munitions. Also noteworthy is the absence in recent government statements in support of a 50-percent reduction in strategic arsenals of a linkage with obligatory observance of the ABM Treaty.

These shifts in London's position arouse the unconcealed delight of U.S. "hawks." One of them—Frank Gaffney, former U.S. assistant defense secretary—calls in the INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE for "Mrs Thatcher's advice to be heeded."

Democratic, peace-loving circles in Britain itself look at things differently. The question of the country's role in the struggle for peace and disarmament is being debated in the press and in Parliament.

In the opinion of the well-known politician Tony Benn, Parliament is virtually debarred from real involvement in shaping the country's foreign and domestic policy.

The British Government bears a considerable share of the responsibility for the fact that the recent NATO Brussels summit did not produce a positive movement on questions of nuclear disarmament. As can be seen, London still cannot understand that putting spokes in the wheel of the process of freeing Europe from nuclear weapons means acting contrary to the interests of the British themselves and undermining the building of the all-European home in which all the continent's inhabitants could feel secure.

France Urged To End South Pacific Nuclear Tests

LD301036 Moscow TASS in English 0922 GMT 30 Mar 88

[Text] Moscow March 30 TASS—Follows commentary by TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev:

Speaking in an interview with the American INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, Vice-Admiral Pierre Thireau, commander of the French force in Polynesia, said that the French nuclear weapons tests could be transferred from the Pacific Mururoa Atoll to Fangataufa Atoll. According to the admiral, this measure has been necessitated by the serious change in the geological structure of Mururoa Atoll.

The point is that over the past two decades, six-eight French nuclear tests were annually conducted in the ill-fated Muroroa Atoll. The narrow coral reef in the shape of a broken ring is only 53 kilometres long. By 1980 big sections of the reef had sunken and numerous cracks and fractures had appeared as a result of the nuclear blasts. On June 25, 1979, a French nuclear device got stuck half way at a distance of 800 metres from the surface, while being lowered into the pit, and was yet exploded. The explosion threw out up to a million cubic metres of rock.

The tropical cyclones sweeping the atoll repeatedly destroyed the facilities of the test range. Radioactive wastes and once even 20 kilograms of plutonium fission fragments were carried out into the ocean. According to the well-founded scientific school of thought, cyclones have become more frequent there as a result of the nuclear blasts. The latter also caused a deep climatic change over a large area of the Pacific.

An alarming ecological situation has emerged around the atoll. It threatens the safety not only of people in Mururoa, but also of inhabitants of Australia, New Zealand and other states of South Pacific. And now instead of putting an end to nuclear explosions in the Pacific or at least conducting nuclear tests in their own territory in France, the government in Paris is planning to transfer the tests from the "unserviceable" atoll to the close lying Fangataufa Island.

It is well-known what angry reaction was caused worldwide by the explosion staged by the French secret service of the ship "Rainbow Warrior" with peace fighters on board in Mururoa Area. Australia and New Zealand have applied to the International Court in the Hague demanding that French nuclear blasts be prohibited. The campaign of protests against the French tests has swept a number of the Pacific countries, including Japan and Peru which are quite far from Mururoa.

French Prime Minister Jacques Chirac, who has joined in the presidential race, has recently said that France, as he claimed, is listened to and respected only because she has demonstrated her determination to go on modernising and, consequently, testing her nuclear devices.

Facts, however, indicate that the way to France's real greateness lies not through the implementation of the nuclear ambitions, even less so at the expense of the security of other peoples. To ensure that France be, as before, listened to and respected, her leaders in Paris should first and foremost themselves display respect for the interests of the peoples of the Pacific, heed their demands for the observance of the basic human rights to life, health and security. The French nuclear tests in South Pacific should be ended.

Mitterrand on Disarmament, French Elections

PM291549 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 88 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "French President's Stance"]

[Text] Paris, 26 Mar—"I have approved more than once already M. Gorbachev's approach to disarmament problems and President Reagan's actions in that direction. I approved the 'zero' and 'double-zero' options. I opposed the immediate modernization of short-range nuclear weapons," French President Francois Mitterrand said in an interview for the Europe-1 radio station in connection with his decision to run for a second term.

Concerning the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, the head of state said, in part: "These weapons are called 'intermediate-range' because they cannot reach the United States. They can 'only' destroy France, the FRG, Spain, and Britain. I am happy that these weapons are being eliminated."

Talking about the U.S. program for the militarization of space, F. Mitterrand stressed: "I condemn the 'Star Wars' plans. I refused to join in with them despite urging from the present government majority. To arm excessively is to take the path that ends in war. The wise thing to do is to disarm, but on one condition: One must disarm wisely."

Having said that the disarmament theme would play a very important part in his election campaign, the French president did make it clear that France would participate in the disarmament process only after a "considerable reduction" in nuclear arsenals by the Soviet Union and the United States.

Concerning the election campaign taking place in France and related matters, F. Mitterrand said that in the event of his reelection to the post of head of state, he would immediately appoint as the new prime minister a figure "whose position coincides with mine." The socialists, he stressed, will play the main role in this government.

If the National Assembly opposed the candidate put forward by him, F. Mitterrand said, parliament would be dissolved and there would be early parliamentary elections. He did not rule out the possibility of the continuation of the current practice of "coexistence" between a socialist president and a right-wing government if, in the course of the parliamentary elections, the right again obtained a majority in the National Assembly. Irrespective of the outcome of this vote I would remain in my post, Mitterrand stressed.

Gerasimov Denies Knowledge of Spies in FRG

LD291446 Hamburg DPA in German 1413 GMT 29 Mar 88

[Text] Moscow (DPA)—The Soviet Foreign Ministry today refused to comment on the espionage affair in the Federal Republic. Asked whether he could comment on the arrest of alleged informants for the Soviet Secret Service KGB, USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov said that he knew of this story only from the papers.

Journalist Charts Improved Soviet-FRG Ties

PM291525 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Mar 88 Second Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Yu. Yakhontov article: "Bonn: What the Barometer Is Reading"]

[Text] A different key and new notes can be heard increasingly frequently now from government rostrums in Bonn. This is especially noticeable when the conversation turns to specific steps taken by the Christian

Democratic Union-Christian Social Union [CDU-CSU] coalition cabinet in the sphere of disarmament policy and to relations between the FRG and its eastern neighbors.

The range of words used by the West German mass media—newspapers, television, and radio—to cover the situation in the USSR and analyze the status of and prospects for Soviet-West German relations has become broader. Of course, the definite warm-up process being experienced on the Rhine is as yet by no means shielded against the cold breath of the past. People are well aware of the domicile of the "instigators" of these relapses. Nevertheless there is evidence of an ongoing salutary process.

Franz-Josef Strauss, Bavarian prime minister and chairman of the CSU, was always considered as the standard-bearer and leader of the West German rightists. He played that role here for decades and he also used to appear as such in our press—and rightly so.

Last December F.-J. Strauss came to Moscow.

To be blunt—this news came as a shock to some people. But for many FRG inhabitants it was a welcome surprise. It finally turned out that the very fact of Strauss' visit to Moscow, his reception in the Kremlin, and also the Bavarian guest's conclusions and statements made at the end of his trip to the USSR had an extremely positive effect, especially on that sector of the West German public which had always considered him their ideologist.

Many people vividly remember Strauss' unkind utterances about the Soviet country and its policy. However, on his return from Moscow to Munich, he found himself able for the first time to look at the world through the eyes of a reasonable, albeit critical politician. He was able to perceive the main thing in his trip and he shared this with journalists: The USSR is not about to propagate the socialist system by violent means; exporting revolution is "not an issue" for the Soviet Union; Moscow does not want war; and the trip to the USSR was useful and necessary.

Justice compels me to admit that it was not only the mood of the Bavarian CSU leader that had changed somewhat, although this is in itself of no small importance, given his influence in his own Federal Land and in the FRG as a whole. The attitude toward our country is also changing, including among West German archconservatives. In short, the barometer needle is pointing to "clear" more and more often.

Professor Hans-Adolf Jacobsen, the well known West German historian, cited interesting data in an article published in the supplement to the weekly DAS PARLAMENT: Whereas in 1984, according to public opinion poll data, 47 percent of those polled stated that "they perceive a threat" from the Soviet Union, and 53 percent answered in the negative, in 1987 only 29 percent continued to fear the "Soviet threat" and 69 percent stated that they do not experience such fears.

I can say with conviction that in the last 2 years the FRG population's interest in the Soviet Union has shown a sharp increase. People want to know what restructuring is and how it is being implemented in our country, what the new thinking is, what the foreign policy aspects of the revolutionary transformations are, what the Soviet proposals on disarmament look like, and the details of the plan for creating a nuclear-free world put forward by Moscow. People here are putting masses of questions to Soviet people today: from Afghanistan to prices in cooperative cafes, from reforms in education to details of the democratization of life.

In short, the atmosphere is clearly changing and naturalness and even warmth are manifesting themselves in relations. This was not, perhaps, the case before.

The progress of preparing the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles and its signing in Washington have, of course, played a large, if not a decisive role in the change of sentiments. These missiles are here on FRG territory. The treaty under which they must be withdrawn from the country means a real step in dismantling not only first-strike systems but also in eliminating targets for a retaliatory strike. People in the FRG are well aware of this and, I must say, assess it accordingly. Even doubters and skeptics are gradually changing their positions, acknowledging the sincerity and gravity of the USSR's intentions regarding disarmament and its principled, categorical refusal to resolve any problems militarily.

Of course, the fruits of the new thinking are not to everyone's liking. Christoph Bertram, a well known journalist in the country, wrote recently in the weekly DIE ZEIT that the "Atlanticists now fear the Soviet disarmament proposals more than war." "It would be very unpleasant if the USSR proposed a 'third zero'," the conservative DIE WELT continued this theme. "Akhromeyev, the chief of the Soviet General Staff, will protect us against this." That's what they said.

I think that hardly anyone could accuse the incumbent Bonn government and the CDU-CSU-Free Democratic Party coalition parties, who are in power, of particular sympathies toward the Soviet Union or of "leftist" views. Rather the contrary. First and foremost the whole point is probably that both the FRG's "geostrategic" position and the fact that it is bristling with nuclear, chemical, and other modern weapons of mass destruction, not to mention the presence on its territory of at least 20 nuclear power station reactors precludes for any reasonable man the possibility of the FRG's participation in a conceivable military conflict: If, of course, you

are thinking of preserving both the country and its population. Presumably these obvious ideas are not alien to those who are now determining West German state policy.

I was once more convinced of the advent of different times and different sentiments in the FRG's political thinking when I met L. Spaeth, both prime minister of Baden-Wuerttemberg and CDU deputy chairman, in Stuttgart.

That Land is in the southwest of the FRG and is one of the most industrially developed Laender. It is also well known in the international market: Baden-Wuerttemberg's output accounts for 1.3 percent of the total volume of world trade and its exports amount to over DM100 billion per year, exceeding the exports of such countries as Sweden, Switzerland, Brazil, and the PRC. Baden-Wuerttemberg produces automobiles, electronics, clocks and watches, precision machinery, and chemical and optical products.

"We need dialogue," L. Spaeth said. "It is necessary to create an atmosphere of constructive cooperation and new ideas on disarmament. But whatever the importance of this topic we must not confine ourselves solely to it or, for instance, to human rights. We must weave the kind of fabric of economic, scientific and technical, and cultural ties, which would help to build greater trust between our peoples."

I asked my interlocutor what he thinks about the claims that developing cooperation with the USSR helps to increase and reinforce the latter's might and thus creates "new problems"?

"I have always asked: What sort of Soviet Union are we interested in?" L. Spaeth answered. "One which has broad international ties and therefore needs stability in Europe and the world or one which is isolated from other countries and is therefore unpredictable in its actions? There can only be one answer. True, there is still one detail: We ourselves need to overcome the distrust of other Western countries provoked by our ties with the USSR. I see that the way out lies in having more consultations with Western European allies and sharing our plans and thoughts with them.... Perhaps, spheres will be found where we will be able to cooperate with you, together with France and England, in our common interests if we can develop economic ties and not argue and quarrel."

About 2 weeks after my conversation with L. Spaeth I had a meeting with J. Rau, prime minister of Nordrhein Westfalen, another Federal Land, a very popular figure in FRG political life, and deputy chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, which is the main opposition force in the country.

Nordrhein Westfalen is the leading FRG Land not only in terms of economic potential (the Rhine-Ruhr industrial region, the largest in West Germany is located here); but also in terms of population—17 million people, approximately 30 percent of the FRG population, live here; and in terms of the scale of its ties with the Soviet Union—approximately 40 percent of the entire output which the FRG supplies to the Soviet Union is produced here. And 26 percent of Soviet deliveries to the FRG come to this land.

To begin the conversation, J. Rau said that he is delighted with the growing dialogue between our countries and the fact that the Federal Government has now adopted elements of Ostpolitik initiated by W. Brandt.

"This dialogue would not occur without the Social Democrats," J. Rau believes. "I would advise the Federal Government," he said, "to continue to cultivate the seeds sown by the Social Democrats on the field of FRG-USSR relations."

J. Rau thinks that despite the individual problems which still have to be resolved, good prospects are opening up before both countries. There are opportunities for the broad development of cooperation. But they are, of course, not being fully used as yet.

We have, J. Rau believes, many common historical cultural roots. We must draw everything positive from them. Everything which enables us to conduct a frank, constructive dialogue. The franker the dialogue, the more productive it is.

The announcement that by mutual agreement an official visit by Federal Chancellor H. Kohl to the Soviet Union will take place in the fall of 1988 and that in the first half of next year M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, will visit the FRG was greeted with great satisfaction among all sections of the population without exception. I can form this opinion merely by the fact that on the very day that this news was announced on television and radio the PRAVDA office received several telephone calls. The callers expressed their approval of this decision. Newspaper, television, and radio commentaries regard the agreement to exchange visits almost unanimously as evidence that relations between our countries have indeed begun to shift to a new level. The choice in favor of cooperation and rapprochement has been made.

FRG Trade Union Delegation Discusses Links

PM291523 Moscow TRUD in Russian 29 Mar 88 p 3

[Article by TRUD correspondent I. Belov incorporating interview with Lothar Zimmermann, member of the German Trade Union Federation Federal Board Executive Committee: "For the Sake of Trust"; date and place of interview not given]

[Text] A delegation from the German Trade Union Federation [DGB] was in the Soviet Union 23 through 27 March at the invitation of the AUCCTU. The guests

from the FRG discussed with their Soviet colleagues in Moscow and Tbilisi questions of intensifying trade union cooperation in the sphere of culture, met with representatives of various creative unions, and acquainted themselves with the organization of amateur art activities.

The delegation, headed by Lothar Zimmermann, member of the DGB Federal Board Executive Committee, had a conversation with S.A. Shalayev, AUCCTU chairman. In the course of this meeting the Soviet side stressed its interest in strengthening ties with West German trade unions. Expanding cooperation in the cultural sphere, S.A. Shalayev pointed out inter alia, is an important element of these ties, which help to strengthen understanding between the two countries' peoples and help both sides cast off prejudice and distrust.

Before leaving for home, L. Zimmermann said in response to the TRUD correspondent's questions:

"We discussed a number of joint projects for the next few years. Thus, a festival of FRG worker's art will take place in Donetsk and Zhdanov. Next year Soviet Trade Union Culture Day will take place for the second time within the framework of the traditional Ruhr festival. We and our Soviet colleagues have plans to organize joint theatrical productions and ideas on exchanging producers and actors. In my opinion this illustrates both sides' quest for new, nonstandard forms of cooperation.

"I must not fail to say that all the meetings with Soviet colleagues took place in a frank and constructive spirit and in a cordial atmosphere. I would especially like to single out the conversation with the AUCCTU chairman during which we talked thoroughly about the difficult tasks which Soviet trade unions are working to resolve at present.

"We regard restructuring as a sort of breakthrough toward new frontiers. If the Soviet Union is successful in developing the economy and in improving all society this will benefit the entire European continent, since East-West cooperation will be boosted to a new level. It is quite obvious that peace in Europe and throughout the world will be more stable in this case."

Gorbachev Book Published in FRG

LD301416 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 30 Mar 88

[Text] The book by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, "Restructuring and New Thinking For Our Country and the Whole World" has been published in German by a Munich publishing company under the title "Restructuring: The Second Russian Revolution." The book has been awarded the "Political Book of the Year" prize by the West German Association of Publishers, Booksellers, and Librarians.

Shevchenko Assesses Visit to Nordic Countries

PM300949 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Mar 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview with V.S. Shevchenko, head of Soviet parliamentary delegation visiting Nordic countries, in Stockholm by own correspondent A. Sychev under the rubric "Facts, Events, Opinions": "'We Have the Basis For Success....'"; date of interview not given—first two paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] A 3-day visit to Sweden has concluded the visit by a group of USSR Supreme Soviet deputies led by V.S. Shevchenko, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, to a number of north European countries: Denmark, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden.

A considerable amount of work has been done. There have been numerous meetings and lively exchanges of opinions on the most vital topical issues. There have been very full days spent in Sweden, the last stop on the itinerary, which means the time has come to sum up the first results. I had a conversation on this subject with Valentina Semenovna Shevchenko, the head of the Soviet parliamentary delegation.

[Shevchenko] In the course of our visit we tried to outline the basis for collaboration between our countries' parliaments and speed up the process of government consideration of the Soviet Union's recent proposals. Our countries are neighbors. We have common interests, both in reducing the level of military tension in the region and ensuring lasting security and in expanding ties in the sphere of cultural exchange, trade and economic cooperation, environmental protection, and other areas. Our discussions also touched on the questions of creating a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe and the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles signed in Washington.

In the north European capitals we expressed our concern that, although not a single missile affected by the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles has yet been destroyed, the West is already nurturing plans to modernize its nuclear missile arsenal on the continent. They tried to tell us that it is not a question of modernization but merely of maintaining these weapons at the latest technical level. In our opinion, this interpretation cannot conceal their clearly destructive intentions, which are not in the interests of the European peoples, who have been given hope of a world free of the nuclear threat for the first time.

We are agreed that European problems are extremely complex and should be resolved as a whole after due consideration. Precisely this approach forms the basis of the Soviet initiatives encompassing northern Europe, southern Europe, military-political aspects, and general human aspects. We came up against attempts to set these problems off against one another during our visit.

The parliaments and legislative commissions of the northern countries have already studied and discussed the Soviet proposals. The Swedish Foreign Ministry informed us that the meeting of north European states' foreign ministers currently being held in Norway has adopted a decision to speed up the work of the group of experts responsible for preparing reports on the entire complex of our initiatives. This piece of news is evidence of positive improvement. Consultations between our countries, and also with the United States and Canada, that are in our common interests should not be dragged out. The disarmament process which has begun on European territory has still not even touched the seas washing European shores, where an increasingly threatening situation is taking shape. And in this case it does not matter that no nuclear weapons are stationed in these particular countries or that Sweden is neutral. It is our duty to the electorate to make our own contribution to strengthening peace.

Of course, we do have some differences in our approaches and views. It could not be otherwise. These difficulties can certainly be overcome, however. Parliamentarians must only galvanize their exchanges of opinions, and governments have only to sit down at the negotiating table and define their positions on all the problems posed by life.

The basis for success exists. We encountered a heightened interest in everything now taking place in the Soviet Union and in the solution of all the most serious topical problems. Oslo held its first parliamentary "roundtable," which was broadcast on Norwegian television across the whole country. All the members of the Norwegian parliamentary foreign policy committee are coming to the Soviet Union. Denmark has expressed an interest in having a television link-up between the Supreme Soviet and the Folketing. We have agreed to continue to develop various forms of contact between our parliaments, which will undoubtedly be only to the benefit of our common cause—to strengthen security and peace in the world, as well as mutual understanding and cooperation.

Greek Foreign Minister Views Regional Issues

PM291405 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Mar 88 Morning Edition p 6

[Report on "IZVESTIYA interview" with K. Papoulias, Greek foreign minister, in Athens by own correspondent G. Shakhunyan under the heading "Greece in Favor. Athens Supports New Soviet Proposals on Balkans and Mediterranean"; date of interview not given]

[Text] We welcome the new Soviet peace initiatives proposed in Belgrade by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Greek Foreign Minister K. Papoulias said. These serious, inspiring proposals are regarded by the Greek Government as an important contribution to peace and to the tasks of ensuring security for all peoples living in the Mediterranean region and the Balkan countries and curbing the arms race in our world.

Despite his heavy workload, the minister kindly agreed to receive our IZVESTIYA correspondent and give him his opinions on the new Soviet peace initiatives which, he believes, are "a very important event in contemporary political life."

The Soviet leader's proposals, K. Papoulias said in our conversation, have aroused a great deal of interest throughout the world. But, it goes without saying, they have particularly important significance for countries on the Balkan peninsula and in the Mediterranean region—this sensitive meeting point of many serious, complex problems. As you well know, a meeting of Balkan states' foreign ministers came to a close quite recently; for the first time in many years they managed to jointly adopt decisions opening the way to cooperation between them in various spheres. The Greek Government, however, believes that the most important task now is to make efforts aimed at turning the Balkans into a nuclear-free zone and a region free of chemical weapons. That is why we consider the Soviet Union's constructive, specific proposals to be extremely timely. They will make it possible to lower the level of military confrontation in the region by "freezing" the number of Soviet and U.S. ships and their naval potential in the Mediterranean and later by reducing and withdrawing the fleets of the two great powers. All this will make it possible to then take new steps to reduce tension in the Mediterranean region and embark on real disarmament measures.

Events of historic significance took place at the end of last year. The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles was signed, and, as the Greek Government hopes, it will soon be ratified. It is important to ensure that this is followed up by new steps aimed at ensuring peace and detente. The peoples of the world expect these steps to be taken at the forthcoming meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan in Moscow. We must not miss this historic chance to make the detente process irreversible. The proposals put forward in Belgrade and their practical implementation could become an integral part of this process, on which the fate of all countries, including Greece, depends. For us it is also particularly important that Mr. Gorbachev's proposals have once again shown that the Soviet and Greek viewpoints on the main problems of contemporary politics, and primarily with regard to curbing the arms race, essentially coincide.

Come and have a look over here, the minister paused and walked to the window. I saw the Greek Parliament building through the window.

The Greek people will be celebrating their most important day—Independence Day—in this square in front of parliament on 25 March. In connection with this important event I would like to say that the surest way to

guarantee peace and detente is to strengthen mutual understanding and friendship between peoples. The Greek and Russian peoples are bound by their long-standing, firm friendship.

We are satisfied with our mutually advantageous, equitable ties with the Soviet Union, which are developing successfully in all spheres. They have become sincere and really friendly.

Greece is following the transformations under way in your country with great interest and sympathy. We highly value the successes which the Soviet Union has achieved and feel confident that you will continue to progress toward attaining your goals. We are countries with different political systems, but our relations serve as an example of how, despite this, peoples can and must live in peace.

Cypriot Communist Party Leader Retires

PM291407 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Mar 88 Second Edition p 7

[Own Correspondent V. Potapov report: "Letter from E. Papaioannou"]

[Text] Athens, 24 Mar—Ezekias Papaioannou, general secretary of the Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus [AKEL], has written a letter to the party Politburo in which he points out that he will be 80 next 8 October and that he will then have been general secretary since 1949. E. Papaioannou noted that he has devoted all his efforts to the service of the party and the liberation struggle of the Cypriot people. "However," he writes, "I think that the time has come to hand over the party's leadership to a younger comrade and for that reason I am sending this letter to the Politburo and the Central Committee. I would like to add that I will continue to work for the good of the party and the people."

The AKEL Central Committee plenum thanked Comrade Papaioannou warmly for his long and invaluable service to the party, working people, and people of Cyprus. They asked him to remain as general secretary of the party until the election of a new candidate. Thereafter by party decision Ezekias Papaioannou will hold the position of honorary chairman.

Latin America & Caribbean

Ortega Accuses U.S. of Hindering Settlement

LD301015 Moscow TASS in English 0931 GMT 30 Mar 88

[Text] Managua March 30 TASS—The U.S. Administration is dragging its feet with settling the situation in Central America and is seeking to scuttle the direct talks between the Nicaraguan Government and the chieftains of armed counter-revolution, said here President Daniel Ortega.

Speaking at a ceremony of awarding the Augusto Cesar Sandino order to Brian Wilson, prominent U.S. peace champion in Central America, he noted that that was exactly the reason for Washington's desire to allocate at any cost a new material aid to the hirelings, which runs counter to the spirit and letter of the Guatemalan agreements.

An end or continuation of the bloodshed in Nicaragua and the life of hundreds of innocent people depend on a decision of the U.S. Administration and Congress, said Daniel Ortega. President Reagan pledged his word to sit at the negotiating table with Nicaragua after the end of the dialogue between the government and the contras, noted the president. "We hope that the USA will honour its word and will start talks with Nicaragua," the Nicaraguan leader went on to say.

Daniel Ortega called on the U.S. Government to resume the bilateral talks to achieve mutual security and to normalize relations between the two countries.

Panama Complains of U.S. Actions to UN

LD300802 Moscow TASS in English 0720 GMT 30 Mar 88

[Text] New York March 30 TASS—Panama has expressed at the U.N. serious concern over the actions of the United States.

A letter of Jorge Eduardo Ritter, permament representative of Panama at the U.N., to U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar was circulated here Tuesday. It pointed out that the U.S. was openly using the Southcom Headquarters located in the Panama Canal Zone.

According to the information of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Panama, some 40 American journalists were invited to the headquarters for detailed instruction on how they should cover the developments in Panama.

The letter said that this step was another proof of hostile actions against the Panamanian Government and a psychological war against the Panamanian people. Moreover, the Southcom Headquarters situated in Panama seeks to turn journalists from the United States and other countries into a tool for waging a psychological war, the letter continued.

The document pointed out the illegal nature of the presence of U.S. Southcom on national territory of Panama and of its open use, primarily for destabilizing the situation in the country.

UK Falklands Exercises Seen as 'Provocative'

PM291505 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 88 Second Edition p 5

["Viewpoint" report by own correspondent Sergey Svistunov: "At The 'Fire Focus'"]

[Text] Lima—The British military maneuvers off the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands, codenamed "Fire Focus," have entered the decisive stage. Subunits of the British

Navy, Air Force, and airborne assault forces are involved in them. The "war" in the islands is at its height at the moment, as is the propaganda ballyhoo over the biggest military maneuvers in that part of the South Atlantic since 1982, when the territorial conflict over the archipelago broke out between Argentina and Britain.

The problem of the islands has still not been resolved. Argentina's repeated attempts to strike up a dialogue with Britain to bring about a peaceful settlement of the disputes have always been rebuffed by London.

In this situation "Fire Focus" sheds light not only and not so much on London's policy as on Washington's regional aspirations. This saber-rattling at the other end of the world does not promise Britain any obvious political dividends at the present moment; on the contrary. But it has been an appropriate maneuver to distract Latin Americans from U.S. subversive plotting against the Republic of Panama.

It is worth noting that in the British parliament, Labor Party members have directly accused the M. Thatcher Conservative government, saying that the inappropriate Falklands military maneuvers are "payment of an old debt"—payment for the enormous political and military support Washington gave London in 1982, when it publicly took the side of its NATO ally. In so doing, it effectively wrote off the Inter-American Treaty on Mutual Assistance guaranteeing collective security to the states of the Western Hemisphere in the event of "outside aggression."

But that is just one side of it.

The background to the militarist games in the Falklands, which last nearly a whole month, until 31 March, has many layers. Some Latin American observers believe, for example, that the maneuvers are also intended to destabilize the political situation in Argentina and indirectly interfere in its internal affairs. As is known, the slogan of "restoring national prestige" and "a more radical approach to healing the Malvinas wound" was one of the banners of the military revolt stirred up in January by Lieutenant Colonel Aldo Rico. By taunting the young Argentine officers with provocative actions in the archipelago, London is deliberately trying to kindle their dissatisfaction with the present supreme command. At the same time, as the Lima magazine CARETAS writes, Britain is trying to get Argentina to make concessions or the kind of political gestures which will allow London to hold talks on the islands from a position of strength.

Whereas "Fire Focus" is an act of political expediency, the problem of the disputed archipelago affects far more signficant geopolitical interests. NATO's "unsinkable aircraft carrier" in the South Atlantic and Easter Island in the southern part of the Pacific basin, which the Pinochet regime has agreed to sell to the Pentagon, has a strategic pincer grip on the countries of South America. And the potential uses of these "pincers" are very wide-ranging—from a U.S. gendarme bridgehead, if the need arises to wave the "big stick" in that part of the world, to their insertion into the front line of a nuclear conflict and the "Star Wars" program.

Thus, it is in the interests of the U.S. and British military-industrial complexes that the solution of the question of who the islands belong to should be delayed for as long as possible and hampered by London's unilateral actions. It is through their efforts that the distant South Atlantic islands are at the "fire focus."

Interview With Chilean Rebel Group Cited

PY281763 Moscow in Spanish to Chile 2130 GMT 26 Mar 88

[Report on "highlights" of interview given by Movement of the Revolutionary Left leaders to Buenos Aires journalist Sandra Russo of PAGINA 12 in Santiago; date of interview not given]

[Text] On 10 March, the Buenos Aires newspaper PAGINA 12 published an article by its special correspondent in Chile Sandra Russo. The article includes an interview with the clandestine leadership of the Movement of the Revolutionary Left [MIR].

The Argentine journalist writes: Chileans are approaching the date of the plebiscite that will decide who will be their next president amidst an increasingly hot atmosphere characterized by the extension of the state of emergency, political strife, and terrorist attacks that disturb deserted streets after 1100 p.m.

The article adds that this is the first interview that the clandestine MIR leadership has granted in over 1 year and that it was held this week in Santiago.

In the interview, the four main MIR leaders discuss their position regarding the upcoming plebiscite following the split by the Chilean opposition into two large blocs.

After three tense meetings with a contact in Santiago, and in public, the journalist was blindfolded and taken to a private house where she was awaited by Pablo, Antonio, Rodrigo, and Arturo who had just arrived in Santiago. All four of them were wearing hoods. There was no excessive display of guns during the meeting but there were guns in the room. During their introduction the MIR leaders appologized for wearing hoods, for the meetings that had been canceled to avoid being followed, for the exhibition of guns, and for the overall intimidating atmosphere.

Pablo said that during the past year they had been submerged in an exhaustive debate about violence and death, which, he said, is a social fact, a social relation, because, he asserted, a rifle can kill. You can also be killed if someone throws a typewritter at you. Beyond the instrument we must reflect on this relationship which leads to death and killings.

[Russo] There are some leftist sectors which have decided to promote the no-vote. Within the United Left [IU], of which the MIR is a member, there was a recent incident when some socialist sectors expressed their support for the no-vote. What was the internal development that led to the establishment of these two large blocs?

[Pablo] To understand what is happening in Chile today we must restrict ourselves to three current strategies: first is upheld by the regime, which wants to go from a military-police control stage to one of political control with a consensus. Within this strategy, there are small irrelevant differences on whether Pinochet will be a civilian or military candidate, but all of them are mere noises.

The second strategy is that upheld by what we refer to as the bourgeoisie opposition headed by the Christian Democratic Party. This is a complex faction, difficult to study from a social point of view because it is supported by bourgeois sectors as well as by labor sectors influenced by a bourgeois leadership.

The third strategy is that upheld by the people's movement. In 1986 there were sufficient elements that allowed us to think that we could achieve significant progress in this regard, but the movement has stagnated.

The people's movement is today divided into two antagonistic strategies. There is one sector which believes it is possible to defeat Pinochet if the no-vote wins. There is another sector, comprised of the Communist Party and the MIR, which believes that the only current valid struggle is that which is against the plebiscite. We view the plebiscite not as a technical issue but as the succession of tactical maneuvers aimed at intimidating the people through terror.

We wish to express our solidarity with the comrades who are working in favor of the yes vote. We understand that this form of struggle is valid for many people, and we cannot judge them. However, we think that their action will not guarantee the reconstruction of democracy.

[Russo] What is the role of the armed struggle within this scene you have just described?

[Rodrigo] We are a political-military organization and therefore we think it is essential that the people have a military capacity because the dictatorship is military. The repression has worsened and will worsen further. We must extend our self defense through the country.

[Ruso] Some people think that the armed struggle could cause a boomerang reaction justifying the regime.

[Pablo] History demonstrates exactly the opposite. This regime did not need our vanguard military activity for it to apply state terrorism. If no military activities had been carried out in the last 14 years, the traditional leftist profile would now be much more weak. An essential step toward the moral reconstruction of the people was to demonstrate that the regime cannot act with total impunity. I believe that this kind of criticism stems from the fact that military activities have been reduced merely to commando actions.

[Russo] The government announced a month ago that the MIR and the Manuel Rodriguez Patriotic Front [FPMR] planned to carry out joint actions this year. This has not been either confirmed or denied.

[Pablo] That is propaganda of the dictatorship. We are morally and political identified with the FPMR, but it is not necessary to plan any joint action or to establish clandestine agreements.

[Russo] What would happen to the armed struggle if a freely elected civilian government were elected in Chile?

[Pablo] As long as the great democratic measures demanded by the people are not adopted, no popular organization may disarm itself. How to use military power is another matter. The struggle will not be abandoned until those responsible for the repression are tried. This is not a task for the bourgeoisie, but for the people.

Our struggle will continue. We are not engaged in a gun trade fetishism. We are aware that this struggle is not a proletariat revolution but a struggle for an unrestricted democracy.

The 1980 Constitution does not accept reforms. It must be modified completely, otherwise our future will be very fragile. If we observe attentively the processes of Brazil, Uruguay, and Argentina, we can see that the transition to democracy is totally obscure if the leaderships of the dictatorships remain untouched, that is, if the financial and intelligence apparatus remain unmodified. This can lead to a catastrophe at best if a military counteroffensive ensues.

Russo writes that the exit from the house that morning was similar to the arrival, with the same safety measures to avoid recognizing the place. The car stopped near a station, and that is where the contact ended.

On the way to the airport, the taxi driver commented with enthusiasm that he had registered at the electoral court to be able to issue his no vote in the plebiscite. We will bend the generalissimo's arm, he said.

A little before arriving at the Pudahual Airport, the taxi driver asked Russo if she knew about one of the posters used in the yes vote campaign. The poster showed a map of Chile with a stethoscope, stating that they, the military, are looking after us. The Medical Association immediately published a paid advertisement because the stethoscope in the picture was upside down. We have read the highlights of the interview carried out in Chile by journalist Sandra Russo with the MIR leaders, as published by the newspaper PAGINA 12 in Buenos Aires.

Political & Social

Further on Armenia, Azerbaijan Situation

Socioeconomic Plans Described

PM291421 Moscow TRUD in Russian 25 Mar 88 p 3

[Interview with V.M. Serov, deputy chairman of the USSR Gosplan, by correspondent V. Golovachev: "In a Unified Complex. Extensive Development Program for Nagorno-Karabakh Outlined"; date and place of interview not given—first two paragraphs are TRUD introduction]

[Text] As the report published today states, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo has approved the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution on accelerating the socioeconomic development of the Azerbaijan SSR's Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] during 1988-1995.

A group of senior officials of the USSR Council of Ministers and the USSR Gosplan and of leaders of a number of ministries and departments recently traveled to Stepanakert. They participated directly in drawing up a program of economic and social development for the NKAO. TRUD correspondent V. Golovachev asked V.M. Serov, deputy chairman of the USSR Gosplan, to speak about this.

[Golovachev] What has brought about the need to draw up this program? What can be said about the level of the NKAO's economic and social development?

[Serov] The program's elaboration has been occasioned by laggardness in the development of Nagorno-Karabakh's economic and social spheres, about which questions have been raised by this oblast's inhabitants themselves. The most important thing now, as emphasized in the appeal of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the working people and peoples of Azerbaijan and Armenia, is to concentrate on surmounting the situation which has taken shape and on resolving specific economic, social, ecological, and other problems.

Of course, the NKAO has achieved certain successes in social and economic development. Look: Over the past 3 5-year plans the volume of industrial production there more than trebled, and agricultural production increased 50 percent. There are also definite results in the social sphere.

But it would be wrong to hush up the serious shortcomings and omissions in the economic and social spheres and the considerable errors of the leadership of the autonomous oblast and the republic. Development is not proceeding comprehensively. The plans for capital construction and commissioning of apartment blocks are not being fulfilled. Great difficulties arise in supplying water to the population. Even in Stepanakert water is supplied only at certain hours and is sometimes cut off for 24 hours at a time. Irrigated farming is developing only slowly, although considerable water resources do exist. Proper attention is not devoted to problems of supplying the population with food and preserving and processing agricultural products.

We visited a silk combine, one of the largest in the oblast, and were able to see for ourselves that the working conditions and production amenities (dining rooms, shower rooms, and so forth) there do not meet today's requirements. Road construction has not been tackled in the oblast either, although there are plenty of materials for road construction there. Or take television—there are entire zones which cannot get assured, good-quality reception of three television channels, including the Armenian republican channel.

If we speak of production efficiency, many serious questions have accumulated on this plane too. In many labor collectives discipline has deteriorated and there has been a drop in responsibility for the fulfillment of plans and contract pledges.

[Golovachev] What are the causes of the deformations which have taken shape in the economic and social spheres in the autonomous oblast?

[Serov] This has been caused, above all, by the weakening of the leading and organizing role of both local and republic party, soviet, and economic organs. Many questions have not only ripened but have also long been overripe, you could say. However, the leadership of the NKAO and the Azerbaijan SSR did not raise these questions with the USSR Gosplan. Moreover, not even those funds allocated to the oblast were being assimilated in full, and they ran to tens of millions of rubles.

When we arrived in Nagorno-Karabakh we familiarized ourselves with the state of affairs and tried to focus the local leaders' attention on the urgent socioeconomic problems. But, to our amazement, we heard that the development of the economic and social spheres is not the chief thing today. At the same time, the errors committed manifest themselves even in comparatively simple questions which can perfectly well be solved on the spot. Indeed, was it really impossible to construct a Young Pioneers House over so many years? Or expand the publication of books in the Armenian language? And generally devote far more attention to the population's needs and requirements and be attentive and sensitive to people's national feelings...?

In any case the problems of accelerating the oblast's economic and social development must be resolved, and as quickly as possible. Therefore, today the officials of central economic organs are seeking to shed light comprehensively on these questions and are submitting them for consideration to higher levels.

[Golovachev] What specifically will the planned measures give to the NKAO and each of its inhabitants?

[Serov] An extensive package of measures to accelerate development of the economy and the social sphere has been outlined. Let us take housing construction, for example. Its volume will be increased 40 percent, so that every family has a separate apartment or an individual dwelling house by the year 2000. It is proposed to commission more than 77,000 square meters of housing as early as 1991 (in 1987 approximately 50,000 square meters was commissioned). The rate will constantly increase. The annual increase will amount to 7,000-10,000 square meters. In 1995 it is planned to commission apartment blocks with a total area of 117,300 square meters.

It is also planned to ensure the switch chiefly to single-shift teaching in general education schools by 1995. For this 9 or 10 schools will be constructed. It is intended to provide in the next 5-year plan for the construction of an 850-seat Palace of Culture, a 400-bed oblast hospital with a medical center to handle 600 visits per shift, a Young Pioneers House, a city library, and many other social projects in Stepanakert.

The question of creating an Armenian Drama Theater in Baku is to be examined, and a package of measures to carry out further work on restoring and rebuilding historical and cultural monuments on NKAO territory is to be drawn up and implemented.

As early as next year the population of Nagorno-Karabakh will be able to receive not only the all-union television channel but also transmissions of the Azerbaijan and Armenian television channels. Construction of the Karabakh group water pipeline is also to be completed in 1989.

It is proposed to construct two reservoirs with a volume of 30 million and 20 million cubic meters, modernize the airport, and construct various branches of plants and combines to ensure the population's rational employment. A program has also been outlined to lay on gas supplies to settlements in rural localities. It is planned to lay a gas pipeline. It is planned to almost double the volume of road construction.

The USSR Ministry of Construction, Road, and Municipal Machine Building and the USSR Gossnab are entrusted with ensuring in 1989-1992 the manufacture and delivery of 4 complete highly mechanized brick plants each with a capacity of 5 million bricks a year.

The economy of the Land of the Soviets is a unified national economic complex permeated by thousands and millions of ties. They know no boundaries—neither linguistic nor administrative. This is our great gain. The development of each economic region augments the entire country's might. This is why it is so important to step up the labor and social activeness of collectives in Armenia, Azerbaijan, and the NKAO for the sake of the cause of restructuring and strengthening the internationalist fraternity of all our country's peoples.

Azerbaijan Prepares for Subbotnik

LD291422 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 29 Mar 88

[Text] Preparations are well under way in Azerbaijan for the Communist subbotnik devoted to the 118th anniversary of the birth of Vladimir Ilich Lenin. The main areas of work to be fulfilled on 16 April have in effect been determined. The details are now being refined. The collectives intend to use this day to reduce the arrears allowed to occur in February and March. The events in Nagorno-Karabakh and Sumgait must not affect the republic's economy; this is the unanimous view of the working people of Azerbaijan. For example, the collective at the Kalinin works of the Neftegazavtomat science and production association has planned to work 1 additional day each month. The enterprise will thereby produce remote control appliances, used on oil and gas fields, valued at R650,000, before the end of the year. The labor collective council of the Kalinin works has urged all enterprises in Azerbaijan to join this initiative. Similar measures have also been undertaken at Khimprom, one of Sumgait's largest associations.

Plants Idle; 'Krunk' Scored

PM291611 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Mar 88 Morning Edition p 6

[Special correspondent P. Gutiontov report: "Stepanakert: Time for Decisions Approaching"]

[Text] My report today will be brief: The city's enterprises are idle, people are at home....

Why? For what reason? Does anyone seriously imagine that this particular path is the shortest one to a solution of Nagorno-Karabakh's problems?

The city's residents are finding in their mailboxes typewritten leaflets signed by the "Krunk" Committee ("Krunk" itself categorically claims that this is a forgery) which has already been disbanded by a decree of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Presidium. On the evening of 28 March I attended the closing session of the committee—a kind of report by the leadership on the work it has done. Let me say bluntly: It is disappointing that, in view of the extremely complex situation in which Stepanakert finds itself today, people who claim the role of spiritual leaders wasted 2 hours on questions involving mainly the formulations used by the republic Supreme Soviet to assess "Krunk's" activity. Just one person mentioned that people are not going to work. It seems as if personal ambitions are still preventing them from making a sober assessment of the situation and using their authority to the benefit of the cause.

I recommended certain members of the former "Krunk" leadership, people who enjoy prestige in the city, to express their attitude toward the prevailing situation. It was agreed that I would convey to the editorial office the text of statements written in their own hand. Just one of them—Senior Lecturer Gamlet Grigoryan from the Teacher Training Institute—came to the hotel at the appointed hour.

Here is the text he handed over:

"I am writing these lines not because I feel insulted that your newspaper has already dubbed me an extremist. I would be altogether very cautious in using the words 'extremists,' 'nationalists,' and 'adventurists.'

"I address my colleagues, and the parents, students, and school pupils. Any study hour that has been missed will undoubtedly entail moral harm for every family.

"The problem raised by the people of Karabakh is still with us today and, in my view, the millions of rubles allocated by our government do not fully remove it. A correct decision on your part—to resume your studies—will no doubt speed up the solution of this problem."

Of course, it is not the Teacher Training Institute students who determine the situation in Stepanakert, and Grigoryan refused to address the workers. Nonetheless, I am sending the text of his statement to the editorial office in the hope that it will be read by all residents of Stepanakert and that they will draw positive conclusions from it.

The time for this is upon us.

Investigation 'Hampered by Rumors'

PM291623 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Mar 88 Morning Edition p 6

[Report by own correspondent R. Talyshinskiy: "Sumgait: Investigation Hampered by Rumors"]

[Text] As has been reported, the investigation is continuing in Sumgait in connection with the 28 February disorders there. The investigation is being conducted by a USSR Prosecutor's Office special investigation group. Our correspondent met with the leader of the group, V. Nenashev, deputy chief of the USSR Prosecutor's Office Main Investigation Administration, and V. Galkin, the USSR general prosecutor's investigator for specially important cases.

[Question] What stage is the investigation at?

[Answer] The group started work 1 March. The USSR Prosecutor's Office announcement of 23 March gives some details. We are aware of the public interest aroused by the investigation, but more we cannot say until the investigation is completed.

The volume of work is immense. At the same time, the duration of the investigation and its meticulousness are of special political importance in light of the events in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and Yerevan. Therefore, several dozen of the country's best investigators, from Moscow, various RSFSR oblasts, the Ukraine, and Belorussia, have been enlisted to participate in the work of the investigation group. Apart from Prosecutor's Office staff, the group contains—we want to stress its multinational composition—investigators from internal affairs bodies, psychiatrists, and other experts.

[Question] Is anything hampering the investigation?

[Answer] It is being hampered above all by rumors. They are still spreading and are continuing to poison the atmosphere. We do not want to repeat the fabrications which benefit only those who do not like to see two peoples living in friendship, but something probably needs to be repeated. The investigation has firmly established that not a single child suffered as a result of the trouble in Sumgait. There were neither 400 nor 500 casualties, but 32, as the USSR Prosecutor's Office announcement stated. Of these 32 people, 26 were Armenians and 6 were Azerbaijanis.

Our talks with people have confirmed that the vast majority of Azerbaijanis were upset by the events. What happened in Sumgait is in no way typical of relations between the two peoples. The investigation has revealed dozens of episodes providing extraordinarily dramatic examples of genuine internationalism. One can categorically state that it was Azerbaijani families, by sheltering Armenians, who saved us from an even bigger tragedy.

[Question] When will the first results of the investigation be known?

[Answer] We are aware that people are impatient to know. But the establishment of the truth must take precedence over all other considerations. We hope that the first results of the investigation will be known in the first half of April.

The party gorkom has told us that the curfew ceased to operate in Sumgait on 29 March.

'Comprehensive and Massive Plan'

NC300628 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0425 GMT 30 Mar 88

[From the review of SOVETAKAN AYASTAN]

[Text] A comprehensive and massive plan. That is the headline under which the paper publishes the heartfelt words of the working people of the republic on the decision [of the CPSU Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers] on measures aimed at accelerating the socio-economic development of Nagorno-Karabakh.

Semen Akhoumyan, the republic's minister of education, says: The decision of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers opens up new prospects of tackling the task of making Stepanakert and the other centers of population more fruitful [bareber] and raising the living standards of the working people. Concrete plans on a massive scale are envisaged for the economic and social development of the oblast. Their implementation will also ensure that the shortcomings and faults of Nagorno-Karabakh's educational complex are put to rights as well.

Arshak Gazaryan, Hero of Socialist Labor, writes: Consistency and thoroughness. These are be the words I would use to describe the measures aimed at accelerating the socio-economic development of Nagorno-Karabakh. The party and the government are truly consistent and thorough in their approach to the affairs and concerns of the autonomous oblast, and they are embarking on urgent measures, not only to normalize the situation created there but also to solve basic and fundamental problems.

'Indefinite Strike' Continues

AU300702 Paris AFP in English 0632 GMT 30 Mar 88

[Excerpt] Moscow, March 30 (AFP)—A indefinite strike by Armenians in Stepanakert, the main town of Nagorno-Karabakh, continued Wednesday, paralyzing factories and public transport, a local official told AFP. A spokesman at the town's official newspaper, SOVIETSKI KARABAKH, said that only essential services were working, such as water pumping stations and bakeries. He said the strike would continue until the people's demands for the transfer of Nagorno-Karabakh to Armenia were met. [passage omitted]

Mood in Stepanakert 'Normal'

PM301319 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Mar 88 Second Edition p 6

[Special correspondent S. Oganyan report: "Difficult Days"]

[Text] Stepanakert, Azerbaijan SSR—I drove into the capital of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast with some apprehension. But I saw nothing in particular. Just reinforced militia details. Otherwise, a city like any other. Beautiful, surrounded by mountains whose slopes are already being covered with greenery. Spring.

How did the new week begin in the city whose name has featured constantly on television screens and newspaper pages in recent days? I will say straightway that people in Stepanakert are seeking to set up a normal work rhythm. Party meetings were held at the majority of enterprises last Saturday. The agenda was the same—to do everything to make up for lost time and satisfy the population's needs more fully.

One of these meetings was held at the Nagorno-Karabakh Dairy Combine.

"Communists decided to do everything to restore the usual production rhythm," B. Petrosyan, secretary of the party organization, said. "The usual rhythm means producing whole-milk products, butter, and cheeses worth R21,000 every day."

Yes, life is following its own course, and you feel this particularly keenly in the maternity home on seeing an anxious father carefully receiving from a nurse a parcel containing a tiny human being. Pink lace for a girl, blue for a boy. How will they grow up? What will their attitude be to their homeland?

"These are undoubtedly important questions," B. Marutyan, chief physician of Stepanakert Maternity Home, entered the conversation. "I have worked here more than 30 years. I know how important it is to surround a person with attention and care from the very first minutes of life.

"The measures taken by the party in recent days and the comprehensive program outlined for Nagorno-Karabakh inspire us all with hope for a better future," the chief physician continued. "The situation must be rectified as quickly as possible, so that the new generation does not have the problems we have encountered."

Stepanakert's residents hark back again and again to yesterday. They repeat the questions being put to the editorial office in numerous telegrams.

Here is a typical dialogue:

"Armenians were forced to leave Azerbaijan as whole families."

"But more than 1,000 Azerbaijanis left Armenia too."

"Why is there not a word about this in the newspapers?"

"So you have taken umbrage at the journalists and therefore do not go to work?"

"No, we want everyone to know the truth. And absenteeism will continue until our question has been resolved."

"But, you will agree, pressure is not the best method. And if people who disagree with you follow your example... Could it not continue indefinitely?"

The 21 March PRAVDA article "Emotions and Reason" is still being discussed in Stepanakert. Each line in it is being studied almost with a magnifying glass. Some people are trying to find in the article a "pro-Azerbaijan" concealed meaning, distorting the meaning of what is printed.

"Why was a single paragraph written about the crimes in Sumgait?"

You have to explain, repeating what was written in the article, that the investigation is still being conducted and that the newspaper will, as promised, return to the tragic events in Sumgait and describe everything in detail after the trial.

...It has started to rain in Stepanakert. The streets and squares are emptying. Only the reinforced militia details do not leave their posts. The city is getting back to normal with great difficulty.

Azerbaijanis Returning to Armenia

PM301359 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Mar 88 Second Edition p 6

[Special correspondent A. Chernenko article under the rubric "This Issue's Reportage": "At the Family Hearth"]

[Text] Armenian SSR—Bagramyanskiy Rayon is currently celebrating its 5th birthday. The rayon center itself, with its houses made of tufa, glinting in the dawn rays of the sun with an amazingly indescribable light, reminded me of the first settlements on the Baykal-Amur Railroad. Some 12,000 people will be living in Bagramyan.

Armenians, Osetians, Russians, Kurds, Georgians, Belorussians, Greeks, Assyrians have worked side by side in the villages of Bagramyanskiy Rayon and continue to do so today.... You can hear Tatar, Uzbek, and Ukrainian spoken here. But the village where Azerbaijanis live side by side with Armenians is Bagaran. The village is prosperous and firmly established. So what compelled 14 Azerbaijani families to get up and leave their homes at the time of unrest? Only they themselves could answer this question. But where should one look for them?

"You should look for them in their native village," I. Daniyelyan, chief of the Bagramyanskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Department, told me. "The Azerbaijani families are coming back."

I had a conversation with the Suleymanov family. Geydar has five children. He got up and left—lock, stock, and barrel, as they say.

"I feel ashamed now," Geydar sighed. "Whom did I believe? It was as if God had deprived me of my reason."

So who exactly had Geydar believed?

"Some woman was going around stirring things up.... She said such things..."

"And Suleymanov was not the only one to believe her; even the Communist Ya. Radzhabov fell for it," G. Minasyan, first secretary of the party raykom, added. "He is a doctor, but he even left his medical center, just signed off duty. A member of the party is an authoritative figure. But he just got up and left...."

"When all this started I was at the wedding of an Armenian friend of mine," M. Safarov, an internationalist serviceman recalled. "I immediately rushed into the village. And I managed to make a lot of people see reason."

I have visited a number of settlements in the last few days. I can say, hand on heart, that the overwhelming majority of people living in this remote part of Armenia were busy with the age-old peasant matters at the time when feelings were running so high.

"There was no such thing as Azerbaijanis, Russians, and Armenians in the fighting in Afghanistan," M. Safarov said. "We were blood brothers from the same motherland. I have racked my brains to try to understand why some families have suddenly lost faith in this fraternity. I have come to the conclusion that I share some of the blame for this. Yes, it is true. Something that is as natural to me as air or water is evidently not quite the same for other people. This means that I, like everyone else who cannot conceive of a life without our fraternal union, must daily help anyone who has lost his bearings to find them again..."

These are the young men, and indeed also people a little older, who joined the rayon party organization aktiv during those days. It is characteristic that they were joined by "Karabakh" committee member T. Karapetyan. Having seen his own handiwork, he immediately broke with the committee:

"They are destroying our friendship. We must go our separate ways."

...There is now a great deal of work to be done in Bagramyanskiy Rayon. In the fields and on the farms, in housing construction, and in the party raykom. Everything is being done to keep pace with the spring.

Armenians Returning to Sumgait

PM301403 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Mar 88 Second Edition p 6

[PRAVDA correspondent Z. Kadymbekov dispatch under the "This Edition's Reportage" rubric: "The City Is Calm"]

[Text] Sumgait, Azerbaijan SSR—Armenian families are returning to Sumgait. The Daniyelyans are among them. Our conversation lasted approximately 2 hours. Neighbors who had come to help at a difficult time, N. Daniyelyan said, sat next to us—construction worker Agarza, railroad worker Kifayat Guseynovy, and pensioner Mariya Bondarenko. People regard such genuine fraternal ties as the guarantee of calm and the possibility of living and working side by side.

Later I also met with other inhabitants of Sumgait—V. Andreasyan, a welder at the Gorispolkom Repair and Construction Administration, who recently returned from Yerevan—and also people who did not leave the city at all—Zh. Artyuvov, deputy director of the No 35 Agricultural Vocational and Technical College; E. Martirosyan, a master at the college; and E. Mirzoyan, an electric welder at the aluminum plant—people, who, like thousands of other Sumgait citizens of Armenian nationality, stayed at their work places. Their opinion is unanimous: Everything has been done to stabilize the situation, and life in the city is proceeding at its normal tenor.

...I returned from Sumgait after midnight, as I have several times recently. I did not realize straightaway what had changed in the city during those first nocturnal hours. Everything seemed as normal: Lights were on and there were many passersby on the street despite the lateness of the hour. Then I remembered: The curfew had been abolished in Sumgait as of 29 March. This is, perhaps, the main evidence of the fact that life in the city has returned to an even keel.

Sumgait Gorispolkom Chief Replaced

PM300905 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 17 Mar 88

[Unattributed report: "Sumgait City Soviet Session"]

[Text] A session of the Sumgait City Soviet, 18th Convocation, has discussed an organizational question. T.Ya. Mamedov was released from his duties as chairman of the gorispolkom for serious shortcomings in the organization of work to ensure proper order and discipline in the city, political shortsightedness, and failure to take measures in good time to prevent the negative phenomena which led to tragic consequences in the city.

R.F. Eminbeyli, who has hitherto worked as director of the Sumgait 60th Anniversary of Soviet Azerbaijan Aluminum Plant, was elected chairman of the Sumgait Gorispolkom.

K.M. Bagirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, took part in the session and delivered a speech.

Sumgait Gorkom Chief Replaced

PM390903 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 17 Mar 88

[Unattributed report: "Sumgait Party Gorkom Plenum"]

[Text] There has been a plenum of the Sumgait Azerbaijan Communist Party Gorkom, which discussed an organizational issue.

The plenum released D.M. Muslim-Zade from his duties as first secretary of the Sumgait party gorkom for political negligence, major shortcomings in organizational and political work, and conduct not befitting a party member, which led to tragic consequences in the city.

Z.S. Gadzhiyev, who has hitherto worked as chairman of the Nakhichevan ASSR Council of Ministers, was elected first secretary of the Sumgait party gorkom.

K.M. Bagirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, took part in the plenum's work and delivered a speech.

Azerbaijan Leadership Condolences

PM291511 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 5 Mar 88 p 1

[Azerbaijani leading organs send condolences on Sumgait deaths]

[Text] From the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee,the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers

The Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers express their deep condolences and sincere sympathy to the families, relatives, and friends of those who died, and also to all those who suffered as a result of the disturbances which took place 28 February 1988 in Sumgait City.

Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee

Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers

Final Part of Analysis of NKAO Events, Lessons

PM271831 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 88 p 4

[Final part of report by special correspondents A. Afanasyev, D. Muratov, A. Mursaliyev, and A. Sarkisyan: "With Anxiety and Hope: We Reflect Today on Events in and Around Nagorno-Karabakh"]

[Text] In Baku, before going to Sumgait, Agdam, and Stepanakert, we spoke with people on whose actions, in particular, the course of events in the republic depended.

We were told that in the emergency situation conventional methods of work proved ineffective. During the days following the Sumgait events, when there was a menacing increase in the mass of all manner of rumors, the thing which proved to be effective was not measures of every possible kind but an around-the-clock "confidence line" telephone service which countered the rumors. Current information helped to ease the tension....

But how in fact did events develop?

Let us picture the atmosphere of those first days. The important thing here is that the nature of meetings changed as events developed. The first meetings put questions to the leadership of the republic. The point they were making was: There is no information. Tell us your position on Nagorno-Karabakh. Why are you silent? It is a reasonable question: We are talking about the sovereignty of the republic.

A little later the mood changed. There were rumors. And the rumors from the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast were followed by refugees from Armenia. Appearing suddenly, with children and hurriedly packed bundles of belongings, they—it must be said—fueled the atmosphere.

Attempts were made to persuade the new arrivals to go back or they were housed in sanatoriums and treatment clinics which were empty for the winter, because it was realized that in the situation which had emerged they could trigger events....

Was everybody everywhere able to make a realistic assessment of the seriousness of the situation?

Who Should Be Followed, Who Should Be Trusted? [subhead]

It was getting toward evening when we got to Sumgait. On the sidewalk in front of the party gorkom bureau there was a table with a telephone on it. If you made a call you would be issued with a temporary pass which was carefully checked by the sentry at the entrance. The streets were already deserted. It would soon be curfew time. There were sleeping bags in the Komsomol Gorkom waiting room—both apparatus workers and squad members spent the night here. There were handwritten signs on the doors of the offices: "Reception Room for Citizens with Statements, Complaints, and Requests To Make"; "Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Headquarters."

In the evening we sat and spoke with D. Muslim-Zade, who was then first secretary of the party gorkom but is no longer. There is only one thing preventing us from writing everything we think about him—while this item was being prepared for the press he was fired and expelled from the party. A few months before, incidentally, attempts had also been made to remove Muslim-Zade, former first secretary of the Azerbaijan Komsomol Central Committee, from that job. But pleasantly and slowly. During a Central Television program he charmingly acknowledged the problems and went through the process of restructuring himself literally before our very eyes.... Now here we were, talking with him for hour after hour, and we could not shake off the impression that on this occasion too there was a hidden television camera somewhere for which our interlocutor was performing, giving careful thought to his image: I must take a profound and dialectic attitude.... Sumgait is only 40 years old and carries in itself all the contradictions of the difficulties of the growth of socialism.... We have 55 hostels for a population of 250,000 people.... Around 20,000 people live in unauthorized structures they have improvised for themselves.... But despite this cities like Sumgait bear a responsibility for restructuring.... They bear a responsibility for what comes next....

Yes, our interlocutor spoke as if he was not primarily the one who should have been solving all these problems. Could he not know how close to reality is the stereotype of a "prosperous" city literally swamped with problems: from housing shortages to pollution and an abundance of chemical plants with all the social ramifications?... Precisely this kind of question can also be reasonably put to the leadership of the republic, which has now made a principled and just assessment of the former gorkom first secretary—political negligence, no less. But what had the leadership itself been doing? Why was what happened a surprise to those who in professional terms had a duty to know?

The meetings started on Saturday, 27 February. Muslim-Zade returned from leave only on the 28th, even though everyone had been warned about the exceptional nature of the situation before that, at a republic party and economic aktiv meeting. At 1330 hours it was impossible to get to the gorkom building in a car—there was a crowd in the way. As he again said: I also knew that this was fate. He climbed onto the platform, took the microphone, and began to work to restrain the crowd.... And then, as he himself describes it, the first secretary decided to "make the demonstration a peaceful one," took his place at the head of the crowd, and attempted to lead it toward the river embankment.

It was a mistake. While the first secretary was marching at the head of the column, the tail broke away from the procession. During the minutes that the first secretary had been orating, what would be called in official language an "uncontrollable situation" was already taking shape in the city. Splitting into several groups, dehumanized people—among whom, it later transpired, there were also recidivists—committed crimes. Not acts of hooliganism but crimes, for which the culprits must be punished most severely.

At around 2000 hours a busload of Komsomol members from the "Khimprom" association were returning to the city from a trip. Nobody knew anything about what was happening. Komsomol committee secretary Elshad Akhmedov explains: "At the city boundary we were stopped by a crowd armed with knives.

"They began to beat and threaten us. Vika Akopyan, a computer operator, was with us. I had a knife poked in my chest. Some of the girls fainted. The bandits climbed onto the roof of the bus and screamed that they would set

fire to it unless we handed somebody over. We all stood firm. Then one of them said: 'There's no one here, let's go.' After that we hid Vika in the Komsomol committee room."

In some apartment blocks (in the 36th quarter, for example) Azerbaijanis defended their friends and neighbors and set up defenses around their apartment blocks. Azerbaijani lads from a Komsomol activist squad escorted Armenian girls out of enterprises, passing them off as their wives.

It was important to calm and help people and give them moral support. Especially since many Armenian families had left the city during those difficult days.

Extract from an activist squad report: "...At around 2100 hours we, workers of the Sumgait Gorkom of the Azerbaijan Komsomol, were patrolling in the area of the 34th quarter. Hearing a scream from one of the apartment blocks on Nizami Street, we went up to the second floor. Ya.D. Agalarov, Komsomol committee secretary at the consumer services production association, was the first to see a man threatening a woman with a hammer. Agalarov disarmed him. Four other people in the apartment had been raiding closets. We also disarmed them."

It must be noted straight away that many Azerbaijanis displayed real internationalism, courage, and simple decency. But the worrying thing was that while some people did indeed become heroes during the events, others attempted to turn themselves into heroes after the events for their own benefit....

"We were fighting organized gangs of criminals," was a concept repeatedly postulated by the city's former leaders. This was probably a way to allow themselves to dissociate themselves from what happened—it was all the work of outsiders, they argued. Indeed there were bandits, and all the indications are that there had been prior preparations for the pogroms. But only an investigation and a court can answer these questions with certainty. As yet it is only a hypothesis. But it can be accurately stated that local inhabitants also participated in the atrocities, beatings, and thefts. It is easier to disclaim responsibility, of course, but... At the Azerbaijan Komsomol Central Committee your correspondents' view was resolutely shared by Central Committee First Secretary Sakhib Alekperov.

Political incompetence cannot be blamed on chance.

Responsibility for the most responsible decisions, ranging from the removal of Armenian families to places of safety to the summoning of reinforcements to Sumgait, was taken by... Who do you think? The gorispolkom chairman? The militia chief? No. An ordinary party gorkom instructor with no professional power to speak of. In the emergency situation the authority of power was replaced by the power of action and authority. And the hour of instructors, community elders, and poets struck. The "informal" authorities occasionally prevented catastrophic events. Azerbaijani families from the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast appeared in Agdam. Their appearance here exacerbated the situation. Meetings began.

Agdamskiy Rayon, Azerbaijan SSR, 22 February. Two young inhabitants died during a skirmish on the border with Askeranskiy Rayon (which is part of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast). How? Why? Who was to blame? Why had a group of young men from Agdam gone there at all? Were they really going to a demonstration in Stepanakert out of curiosity, or did they they have other, less innocuous intentions? Where did the other group near Askeran come from? These questions will be answered by an investigation. But on that day, 22 February, thousands of agitated people left Agdam and headed for Askeran. It was difficult to predict how the mob law might end. There were militia posts and posts of party, soviet, and Komsomol workers clustered along the roadside. It was literally only a few minutes' walk to the border between the rayons. A Uazik 91-34, forcing its way through along the edge of the road, got to the front and stopped sidelong across the road.

The column had gotten right up to the vehicle when a short woman climbed onto the hood. People recognized her as Hero of Socialist Labor Khuraman Abbasova, chairman of the Lenin Kolkhoz.

What happened next is almost like something from legend. Khuraman-Khanum took off her bright, gold-embroidered headscarf and raised it above her head. By ancient custom a woman's scarf, a symbol of maternal honor, when thrown down in front of a man stopped bloodshed. Khuraman-Khanum cannot now remember exactly what she said at the time. But others do remember. We wrote down verbatim what many people told us: "'Kill me!' Khuraman-Khanum screamed. 'Trample on my scarf! And then go and fight! If you can carry on, go!'"

The crowd turned back. They say that men wept. One youth tried to leap past her and she slapped his face. Afterward, in the party raykom conference hall, Khuraman-Khanum passed out....

On another road Agdamskiy Raykom First Secretary Murtuzayev went out and stood in the road in front of cars heading for Stepanakert. In Baku there was a story going round that he got down on his knees in front of the cars and at the last moment they turned away. Murtuzayev demolished the story. He did not get down on his knees. He did not plead. He went out. Stood. And stayed there.

No, S. Murtuzayev does not need hero worship. He did what he had to do. And now he has very little to say.

Unfortunately there are few such examples. There are more examples of a different kind.

Party, soviet, and Komsomol workers were speaking at a student demonstration in Baku. But their speeches had no effect. The situation was rectified by an authoritative person, the poet Anar. "Let Anar speak, we trust him!"

Let us ponder this: When a difficult situation arose, when it was constantly necessary to work with agitated people, the people who were professionally responsible for "work with people" immediately turned to informal authorities—poets and writers. Did they feel that their authority was not enough? Evidently so: For many Komsomol workers in Azerbaijan, including Central Committee secretaries, had not even met young people face to face before this....

In Armenia Central Committee workers from the republic Komsomol worked in general in conditions which were close to "clandestine." At a meeting, we were told simultaneously by Central Committee secretaries, "people would know if you were wearing a Komsomol badge, even if it was hidden beneath your jacket. When working with people you had to take off your necktie." Many people in Yerevan recalled how one of the leaders of the republic Komsomol literally tried to grab the microphone in an attempt to speak, but...

When pondering what happened you can already see that the unprecedented situation left some people numb and paralyzed. Others, by contrast, were spurred to action. Those who went out into the streets, of course, also included sincere people—people who believed in an idea and its justice. There were also people who previously had simply lacked an active, charismatic leader. There was a lack of serious dialogue (during a meeting at Yerevan University we became convinced of this: A conversation which had begun with curtness and distrust ended with totally amicable and warm handshakes). But there were also people who were prepared to stir up the situation to a dangerous pitch, who were unwilling or unable to accept any reasonable alternatives. Unfortunately it was many of these people who took the places of those who had been paralyzed.

In Yerevan we were told:

"To be honest, we have been used to organizing meetings and demonstrations ourselves. But what do we do if meetings take place without us? We weren't prepared...."

That is the the truth. But not the whole truth. For other people were prepared.

So What Is the Way Out? [subhead]

We have been in five cities in the two republics. We have made voyages into history. We have discussed current problems. We have attempted to picture the future of the land of Karabakh. An ancient land. A land rich in talents. The attention of two of the country's republics and maybe the entire world is currently focused on an area of a few thousand square kilometers with a population of less than 200,000 people.... Thousands of people are expressing their wishes by coming out into the streets. Academics are advancing arguments, politicians are pondering decisions. It is the academics' job to substantiate a decision. It is the politicians' job to adopt decisions.

But let us voice an immediate proviso: The role in decisions of those same thousands who have come out into the streets of cities is also extremely great.

It is very important, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed in his Appeal to the working people and peoples of Azerbaijan and Armenia, to assess your own concerns not only in the context of local conditions but also taking into consideration the processes of revolutionary renewal under way in the country.

Which context will we prefer and choose? First and foremost, of course, the concerns and problems of Nagorno-Karabakh itself. If we climb one step higher the horizons of the entire region are disclosed. Another step higher, and we find responsibility to the country, which has opted for restructuring. Finally there is the most complex context—the international context.

Let us be equally cautious in dealing with personal and general interests. Let us treat with equal respect local problems and problems on whose solution the fate of millions of people depends. In a word, let us be citizens, stewards, and patriots of the land of our birth—both the area we call home and the motherland at large.

How can these lessons be linked together? Who will link them together?

In Stepanakert we did not meet a single person who would tell us that he was against the general idea. But in Stepanakert, having spoken with dozens of people, we realized that there are different people here, people who are unwilling or unable to consider other viewpoints but also people who take a realistic and sober view.

One of our interlocutors in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast said: I am a son of my people, but I quite understand that their demand does not coincide at this time with state interests and the general tasks of restructuring. But the problem has got to be solved. An effective option has got to be found....

"Here it is important to make up your mind: Either to stand your ground or to move forward and solve the concrete problems. The restoration of monuments and revival of deserted villages. The solution of economic, ecological, and social problems—surely this should not be put off until tomorrow?"

Are there arguments against? Indeed there are! We heard the main one: We do not believe that Nagorno-Karabakh's problems will be solved unless it is transferred. So

it is administrative decisions and legal and economic guarantees that are needed? But why not choose the constructive path here too? It is well known that the rights of autonomous oblasts have not been defined in detail in the USSR Constitution. So maybe they should be defined, and not only in detail but in contemporary, progressive terms?

So that these rights would guarantee the fulfillment of the tasks which have been spelled out today. And maybe broader tasks too? So that these rights, without infringing the republic's rights or negating the principles of autonomy, would radically improve them by enshrining in legislation social and economic relationships (imbued with new content) both with the republic of which the autonomous oblast is part and with the social organizations and institutions of the other republic.

Standing your ground or solving concrete problems in practice...

As we were told yesterday, the Azerbaijan Komsomol Central Committee has examined the question of measures to expand bilateral contacts among young people and develop in them an ethos of intercommunal communication. We are probably not alone in hoping that this will be followed by real actions.

In general it has to be said that action is the most convincing argument in a complex situation. We recall Abbasova and Murtuzayev from Agdamskiy Rayon in the Azerbaijan SSR. But such resolute and realistic people were also to be found in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

When his drivers refused to go to Agdam—this was after the incident on the border with Askeranskiy Rayon—Gabriel Arutyunovich Balayan, chairman of the "Bakinskiy Rabochiy" Kolkhoz in Nagorno-Karabakh, got behind the wheel himself. "Tell me: Do the cows need feeding? They do! Or maybe they're to blame for something?"

The party and trade union organizers were put in other cars.

The convoy then followed Balayan. And nobody fell behind because they knew who they were following.

Now a few words about the lessons and our personal preliminary conclusions.

We are moving along the path of restructuring. It is an untrodden path. Setbacks are natural. But even now it is important to learn the following lesson: It will probably be necessary to develop models of such difficult situations in advance in order to ascertain how to resolve them effectively and optimally.

In Stepanakert Marat Musayelyan, first secretary of the Komsomol Obkom, put forward something like the following idea: Certain given urgent problems should be taken and analyzed in advance by intelligent people—in other words, the route of restructuring should be planned. The options, possible "blind alleys," and suitable alternatives should be pondered.

An ability to seek and find such alternatives, a desire to avoid driving situations into blind alleys, a wish to find a way out and seek a constructive path is not a sign of weakness but a sign of reasonable strength.

The common edifice which we have all built must not be shaken at the edge of the abyss in the hope of gaining victory at any price. We must not live solely for the past and the even more remote past but must become accustomed to responding to reason with reason and to common sense with common sense.

In order to continue to build the edifice and ensure that the builders do not forget how to understand each other there is a great need for leaders—authoritative and wise leaders. And people will follow them—as people followed Kolkhoz Chairman Gabriel Balayan when somebody had to be the first to cross the "danger line" across the road between Askeran and Agdam. And people will listen to them—as they listened to the impassioned words of Khuraman Abbasova on that same road a few days earlier. These people have known each other well for a long time: How else could it be; they are neighbors!... They stand on the same road. A road which, for a time, divided them. A road which, once again, is uniting them.

'Subversive' Western Role in NKAO Events

PM291011 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 8 Mar 88 pp 3-4

[Article by Doctor of Economic Sciences A. Zargarov, director of the Azerbaijan SSR Academy of Sciences Center for Scientific Information on the Social Sciences: "Who Is Inflaming Passions"]

[Excerpts] Events taking place in and around Nagorno-Karabakh have caused deep pain in the hearts of Soviet people brought up in the spirit of internationalism and patriotism.

A principled assessment of the actions and demands directed at reexamining the existing national and territorial structure has been given by the CPSU Central Committee and in the Appeal by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the working people and peoples of Azerbaijan and Armenia. In particular, it is noted that the situation which has taken shape is causing vital harm to interethnic relations and contradicts the interests of both the Azerbaijani and Armenian peoples.

"We do not want," M.S. Gorbachev's Appeal says, "to evade a frank discussion of the diverse ideas and proposals. But this should be done calmly, within the framework of the democratic process and legality, without causing the slightest harm to our peoples' internationalist cohesion. We cannot let the most serious questions of national destiny be decided by whim and emotions."

When pondering the reasons for such an extraordinary negative phenomenon and its possible unpredictable consequences, one is convinced with renewed force of the wisdom of the well-known aphorism "look at the roots." Indeed, even with the naked eye it is easy to see the painful processes of distrust and suspicion having a negative influence on basically healthy interethnic relations in our society.

But it should be borne in mind that the threads of the events which flared up by no means suddenly end within the territory of the region but stretch beyond our country's borders and create additional complications in cooling passions. And, as before, these difficulties are created by our ideological enemies, professional anti-Soviets and anticommunists. It is typical that bourgeois propagandists have always demonstrated the greatest vigor at the most abrupt turning points in our history, in an attempt to fish in troubled waters. [Passage omitted in which the author describes the role of "bourgeois propaganda" and Western radio broadcasts, which he accuses of interference in the Soviet Union's internal affairs and attempts to subvert interethnic relations and falsify the essence of Lenin's nationalities policy]

The people inflaming passions and the foreign masters of ideological sabotage are making the greatest efforts, and in a number of cases not without success, to excessively inflate the events taking place in and around Nagorno-Karabakh and to transform them into an international problem. Some people are even trying to link them with the solution of current global world problems.

Right now the Western mass media are playing the "Nagorno-Karabakh card" for all it's worth, building on this far-reaching plans to significantly step up the ideological attack on our country. And worst of all—not without the assistance of some of our fellow citizens.

Some readers may ask: Is it worth talking about such things? "The caravan will continue along the same path" all the same. I believe that it is worthwhile and that it is even essential, for we certainly need to know who is sowing discord, to objectively assess the actions both of the builders and the demolishers of the foundations of the Soviet peoples' friendship. It is also worthwhile to dispel all kinds of delusions among certain credulous inhabitants who consider the West to be an outside neutral observer of the events taking place here. This viewpoint is profoundly mistaken, and it is easy to be convinced of this. First and foremost I would like to recall that a few days ago the USSR Foreign Ministry expressed its resolute protest to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow concerning provocative, subversive actions by the government radio station VOA in relation to the Soviet Union's Baltic republics. The sham neutrality of Western Sovietologists can be judged, for example, from information from that same radio station, which reported that a 25 February session of the House of Representatives' Europe and the Middle East Subcommittee discussed the question of... Soviet national policy and that specialists on certain Soviet republics assessed the situation and made recommendations, including from the theoretical viewpoint.

Certain U.S. congressmen have expressed "concern" at the development of events in Nagorno-Karabakh and have made an extremely "serious" recommendation: "Introduce order in these republics by observing the right of nations to self-determination, and radically revise national policy." That's it, categorically and with the tone of a mentor, as if they were dealing with their own state.

Nationalist forces abroad spurred on by extremist elements with the connivance of the authorities have significantly stepped up their activity.

Nor has the notorious "Radio Liberty," the U.S. subversive radio station located in West Germany, remained on the sidelines. Two ideological "brothers" and specialists in ideological provocation via the airwaves took part in its 24 February broadcast under the rubric "Roundtable Commentary"—Eduard Oganesyan, chief editor of this radio station's Armenian desk, and Mirza Khazar, chief editor of the Azerbaijani desk. The conversation was devoted to analyzing the "sources and causes" of the events taking place there. Without going into the details of so "warm" a conversation which took place in a spirit of complete mutual understanding and unity of views, we shall note only one very essential detail: The "friends" came to the conclusion, and really sought to convince their audience, that the primary reasons for the events taking place now in and around Nagorno-Karabakh are the conscious actions and initiatives of the broad people's masses who are dissatisfied with the existing structure.

In an effort to widen the scale of the incident, the Western media are in veiled form calling on other nationalities living in the region, and not only here, to express their effective attitude toward the events taking place, hinting that some are allegedly ready to act.

"Impartial" Western journalists are not averse to fabricating and spreading in the press and on the radio diverse tales about the events taking place in and around Nagorno-Karabakh which are designed to exploit the political immaturity of the ordinary inhabitant with the aim of spreading the dramatic incident to other regions of the country. All this alerts us and requires from us extreme vigilance and wisdom.

The ubiquitous false thesis of "Russian interference" is resurfacing, despite the fact that it is not taken seriously even by those who thought it up. "Purely ethnic disputes," the French newspaper LE MONDE claims, "are a result of the unhealthy relations between the local population and Russian immigrants." There is truly no limit to cynicism!

Such a weapon as political demagoguery too is being selected from the arsenal of anti-Sovietism and brought into play. Some anti-Soviets are speculating on restructuring, democratization, and glasnost, and are testing their viability in the "extreme circumstances." We see in these actions essentially the desire to reduce restructuring to nought, to make it out to be destructive, and to hinder the successful implementation of the majestic creative plans of the two fraternal republics.

What happened in Sumgait is presented by VOA (29 February this year) as an anti-Soviet action of a political nature. But it is generally known that all this was provoked by a group of hooligan elements. Unstable, immature people who had been influenced by provocative rumors and incendiary talk about the events in Nagorno-Karabakh and Armenia were drawn into committing unlawful actions.

The foreign media quite often utilize such "authoritative" sources as statements by "prominent representatives of Soviet human rights defenders," "well-known dissidents," and so on. Their names and "heroic exploits" are mentioned. For example, 26 February this year VOA, using the words of one of them, reported literally the following: "The Armenian people now feels more confident and calm since the entire world community knows about the events in Nagorno-Karabakh and Yerevan. If this is not known abroad, including by Armenians living there, we can expect a new genocide under the aegis of a restructuring Russia." But I believe that not one "figure" who counterposes his own people to another, who by his actions incurs a cautious attitude toward it, can be benevolently disposed toward it or be the expresser of its interests, or secure a respectful attitude toward himself. The people assess on merit those who assist in augmenting their friends and strengthening international ties and all-around cooperation.

While on the subject of overt dissidents we should also not forget that there is unfortunately another category of people whom we rightly call covert dissidents. Those irresponsible people who love to pass themselves off as national heroes but who in essence engage in inflaming quarrels and who make groundless demands while appealing...to like-minded people abroad can be included in this category.

It does not behoove us Soviet people to seek support and advice from compatriots abroad to resolve our own national problems. It is not difficult to understand what recommendations might be given by anti-Soviet-inclined elements who have broken with their motherland and their emigre organizations of dubious repute.

Our country's peoples have entrusted their destinies to their motherland, their fatherland, their party, and their state, and only they have the moral, legislative, and other rights to be its [as published] objective, just arbiters.

The CPSU proceeds from the premise that in our socialist multinational state, in the process of the joint labor and life of more than 100 nations and nationalities, new tasks to improve national relations are emerging naturally. Life is making new demands and is dictating the necessity to interpret critically what yesterday still seemed incontrovertible.

It is important not to smooth over or evade unresolved problems, acute problems, or to remain silent about the shortcomings and difficulties existing in real life. Unity of word and deed in international education is of decisive significance in effectively influencing a person's consciousness and mood.

It is essential to wage a consistent and offensive struggle against attempts to stir up nationalist prejudices among certain people, decisively oppose any deviations from Leninist principles of national policy, instill high patriotic feelings, honor, and dignity, and cogently expose the bourgeois falsifiers.

"The main concern now," M.S. Gorbachev's Appeal notes, "is to concentrate on overcoming the situation which has taken shape, on resolving the specific economic, social, ecological, and other problems which have accumulated in Azerbaijan and Armenia, in the spirit of the policy of restructuring and renewal which is being implemented throughout our country.

"The traditions of friendship between the Azerbaijani and Armenian peoples which have formed during the years of Soviet power must be cherished and reinforced in every possible way. Only this approach accords with the genuine interests of all the USSR's peoples."

There is no doubt that the present troubled times will be a serious lesson for us all. But civic maturity, the daily atmosphere of genuine internationalism, and the science of interethnic contacts do not come about of their own accord. What is needed is lengthy, painstaking work and the active participation of each of us in strengthening the fraternal friendship among the Azerbaijani, Armenian, and other peoples of our great united motherland.

Latvian CP Official Views Nationality Issues

PM241609 London MORNING STAR in English 24 Mar 88 pp 6-7

[Report on interview with Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Secretary Anatoliy Gorbunov by Kate Clark: "Solving the National Question;" date and place not given]

[Text] Events such as the ethnic unrest in Armenia; the student disturbances in Kazakhstan a year or so ago; the demonstrations in the Baltic Republics last August; and

the issue of the Crimean Tatars all show that there are still nationality and ethnic problems in the Soviet Union today.

One of the areas where these problems are being exacerbated by unhelpful or malicious propaganda from Western radio stations is the Baltic Republics of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia.

These republics are the most recent of all the republics in the Soviet Union.

Soviet power was established for a short period at the end of the First World War, but this was ruthlessly destroyed by the reactionaries and counter-revolutionaries in the wars of intervention.

To this day, leading Western powers like the United States and Britain still do not officially recognise the Baltic states as Soviet republics. They became Soviet republics in 1940 after the outbreak of the Second World War.

But present problems there cannot all be attributed to hostile propaganda from abroad. There are genuine grievances—mistakes have been made in the past and national sentiments cannot be ignored.

"There is a problem—and we have to start from the fact," says Anatoliy Gorbunov, ideological secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee.

Despite his name, Mr Gorbunov is 100 per cent Latvian, as his non-russian accent shows.

"All my family were Latvian as far back as we know," he explains. "It is thought that a long time ago Russian landowners in East Latvia gave their names to the peasants working for them—and that's probably how I got my name."

A 45-year-old ex-building engineer Mr Gorbunov has been a Central Committee secretary for four years.

His area is ideology. He admits to an overriding interest in Lenin, in his methodology and approach to all questions.

"The problems were not going away. On the contrary, they were building up," he continues. "The August demonstrations showed that if we don't tackle these problems in a serious way, certain elements in our society will make political capital out of the situation.

"The national problem in Latvia has its roots in the extensive development of our economy, which for years has been causing large-scale immigration into the republic.

"This immigration resulted in a number of social and inter-nationality problems, both for Latvians and for those who came from other parts of the Soviet Union."

This "extensive" development entailed more and more new factories being built, natural resources being consumed at an alarming rate and, of course, the need for still more workers to staff the new enterprises.

This was not particular to Latvia—one of the essential planks of perestroyka is to switch the economy nationwide to intensive methods and resource-saving, recognising the extravagant and wasteful utilisation of the country's national wealth over previous decades.

"In many cases this extensive development demanded a cheap labour force," Mr Gorbunov says. "But that meant that those who invited the migrant workers should have created the necessary conditions for them, in terms of housing and other facilities."

This however was not done, and resentment built up among Latvians when they saw newcomers being given new flats ahead of them.

Now a special commission, set up by by the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, is engaged in a serious analysis of the problems and their solutions.

"And without emotion," Mr Gorbunov adds. "National problems have never been solved anywhere with emotion."

The language barrier has been identified as one of the main problems. Whilst most Letts speak Russian fairly well, most Russians living in the republic—and they make up over a third of the population—do not speak Lettish.

Latvia's party leadership is now doing a lot to promote the Lettish language—courses in Lettish are being organised, phrase-books and textbooks are being issued, and TV programmes are being screened both for teaching Lettish and, more generally, to encourage viewers' interest in Lettish history and culture.

Extreme views which can be heard in Latvia say that non-Lettish-speaking people should not be allowed to live in the republic. The party's strategy, on the other hand, is to encourage non-Letts to learn Lettish.

Last year's demonstrations in the Baltic capitals came as a shock to many people, although Western radio stations had been broadcasting the venues and times well in advance.

"I think we shall have to go throught a period of 'difficult dates' over the next two to five years," Mr Gorbunov remarks.

"We shall do our best to explain to people certain unpleasant facts from our history. We shall not prohibit demonstrations but we shall see to it that they are not extremist, nationalistic or chauvinistic in character."

Mr Gorbunov thinks the party should take the initiative out of the hands of nationalistic groups and speak openly about controversial historical events.

These could include the eviction of real or suspected opponents of Soviet power after the Nazi assault on the Soviet Union and the problems associated with the collectivisation of the countryside.

"The deportations were probably necessary at the time," Mr Gorbunov reflects. "But we cannot approve of the methods and conditions in which these were carried out.

"When the nationalists organised the demonstration commemorating that date, June 14, 1941, people said to us in the party well, why didn't you organise the demonstration yourselves?

"So if we do not approve of the methods used at that time, perhaps we should take part, or even lead, activities honouring the memory of the deportation victims.

"The nationalists live off the fact that we keep silent about many things."

The Stalin period, here as elsewhere in the Soviet Union, is being widely discussed in the media and by people everywhere. In Latvia, as elsewhere, there is no consensus on Stalin's role and actions. Rather there are quite often sharply contradictory assessments.

"Until we really understand this period, we are always going to be caught not knowing how to react," Anatoliy Gorbunov comments.

"It is difficult for many in our generation to condemn Stalin and Stalinism, because they were brought up in the spirit of the personality cult.

"It is not easy for them to give up their views and values.

"But in our assessment of Stalin, we should be careful not to repeat his mistakes—he painted all people either black or white and saw no other colours in-between.

"If we now do the same, this will only lead to unnecessary confrontation in society."

One of the historical events being commented upon here is the Soviet-German non-aggression pact of August 23, 1939.

In Latvia, two research institutes are working on this question and Mr Gorbunov says that an official point of view is expected soon.

Latvia's Communist Party is also looking at the possibility of setting up a commission like that set up at national level by the Politburo last November, to look into possible re-habilitation cases.

Like the national question, where problems have been building up for years, Mr Gorbunov does not see an easy future ahead for perestroyka in Latvia.

"People's thinking has begun to change—and that's very positive," he remarks. "But it hasn't yet touched the economic interests of each worker, each family.

"In the next two to three years our economic reforms will stabilise and only then will real cost-accounting take effect.

"Then we shall come up against some problems and it's not inconceivable that opposition to perestroyka may appear at that stage."

Anatoliy Gorbunov's style is to look problems squarely in the face and work out ways of dealing with them. Where national and ethnic problems are concerned, that must be a better way than sweeping them under the carpet.

Officials Explain Foreign Travel Regulations

PM241039 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Mar 88 Morning Edition p 6

[Report on interviews with V. Kononov, deputy chief of the Moscow Gorispolkom Internal Affairs Administration, and N. Kondratskiy, chief specialist at the USSR Ministry of Finance Consolidated Foreign Exchange Department, by Ye. Nastin under the rubric "Details for IZVESTIYA": "More About Trips Abroad"; date and place not given]

[Text] The material contained in the article "Traveling Abroad by Invitation" (IZVESTIYA No 77) has aroused a great deal of interest among readers. The editorial board has received intercity telephone calls: People have complained that the procedures described in our article do not apply to their city. That is why we would like to make it clear immediately that Moscow is the first city where a sophisticated procedure for foreign travel has been established, and it was to this that S. Alpatov, chief of the Moscow Gorispolkom Internal Affairs Administration Visas and Registrations Administration, was referring in our newspaper. We have managed to establish that this new procedure is going to be introduced in the provinces in the near future.

Now V. Kononov, deputy chief of the Moscow Gorispolkom Internal Affairs Administration, will answer questions of the greatest interest to readers.

"First of all, I would like to say that restrictions have been lifted on reciprocal visits to meet with former Soviet citizens who originally emigrated to Israel, if they

are permanent residents of a third country with which the Soviet Union maintains diplomatic relations and are citizens of that state. Visits to Israel are now permitted in exceptional cases. This is because in conformity with Article 6 of the USSR Law 'On Soviet Citizenship,' the Soviet Union cannot fully guarantee protection for its citizens in that country, as it does not maintain diplomatic relations with Israel.

"With regard to passports, they are valid for 5 years and can be renewed on expiry.

"Repeated trips abroad are permitted over a period of 6 months without application to internal affairs organs only for Soviet citizens with spouses, parents, or children permanently residing in European CEMA countries. It is possible on application, without the submission of other documents, to invite relatives living in CEMA countries if they are Soviet citizens.

"With regard to temporary stays abroad and invitations to the USSR on private matters, there is no longer any need for citizens to agree applications with the administration and social organizations at their place of work or study (this includes the need to obtain references), while members of the CPSU and the Komsomol do not have to agree their applications with rayon (city) party and Komsomol organizations.

"I would like to point out that in the overwhelming majority of cases the reasons for temporary refusals for foreign travel are connected with the applicant's knowledge of information constituting a state secret. However, the task of ascertaining this knowledge is not the responsibility of internal affairs organs but of the ministries and departments in which the citizens applying for an exit visa work or have worked."

N. Kondratskiy, main specialist at the USSR Ministry of Finance Consolidated Foreign Exchange Department, will provide the explanations regarding the financial aspects of trips abroad.

"New regulations governing the sale of foreign currency to citizens have been in effect since 1 January 1988. If a person travels to a socialist country on invitation he may exchange money reckoned on the basis of R15 for every day of his stay. In view of the fact that people may make several trips in the course of 6 months, a maximum norm of exchange has been established: No more than R1,350 per year. A person is guaranteed foreign currency for a 3-month stay abroad.

"For citizens who are permanent residents in the Soviet Union and who travel temporarily to capitalist or developing countries on personal matters, foreign currency is sold on the basis of R7 for every day of their stay abroad, but no more than R420 per year.

"The question of providing foreign currency for people who travel to the place where their relatives are buried is resolved somewhat differently. Foreign currency is sold to them within the limits of the norms for rented accomodation expenses and 70 percent of the norms for daily expenses laid down for people traveling on business trips to the country concerned for every day of their stay, but for no more than 7 days.

"When determining these sums, it is taken into account that the host will supply his guest with everything he needs. The foreign currency resources of our country are also taken into account.

"You can familiarize yourself with the regulations governing this procedure in Soviet banking establishments which sell foreign currency.

"In conformity with current regulations, any person with funds in the form of freely convertible foreign currency in a bank is entitled, when traveling abroad for personal reasons, as a tourist, or on a business trip, to take with him as much foreign currency as he has managed to acquire in exchange for rubles. Only account holders have this right.

"Money in the form of CEMA countries' currency may be taken to these countries without any restrictions, either by the account holder himself or by members of his family."

Revival of Lenin's Control Commission Urged

PM231147 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Mar 88 Second Edition p 3

[Letter from CPSU member I. Sokolov: "Strictly According to Conscience. From the Discussion Mailbag: Addressed to the 19th All-Union Party Conference"—first two paragraphs are in the form of an introduction]

[Text] V.I. Lenin referred to the Central Control Commission (TsKK) as the party and proletarian conscience.

Young and not-so-young Communists today are either not aware or do not see a substantial difference between the former—that is, Lenin's TsKK—and the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee in its present form, regarding them as identical control organs. Meanwhile, they differ from each other very significantly.

The TsKK, just like the Central Committee, was the supreme organ of the party, but only with monitoring functions [kontrolnyye funktsiya]. Just like the Central Committee, it was elected by congress and was accountable only to congress. In other words, in our party there was a separation of power between the Central Committee and the TsKK. The Central Committee had executive functions, while the TsKK was entrusted with monitoring functions.

After V.I. Lenin's death, the TsKK did not survive long. It was abolished on a proposal from I.V. Stalin. To begin with, at the 17th party congress in 1934, it was transformed into the Party Control Commission under the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Central Committee, and from the next, the 18th congress, it was no longer elected by the congress but organized by the Central Committee. Did any of the delegates at the time understand Stalin's design and the tragic consequences this decision was to have? Our present political experience gives us every justification to claim that this was a fatal political mistake which cost the party, the state, and the people dear. The Stalin cult in its ugliest and most criminal form—the totally unfounded repressions—began precisely with the abolition of the TsKK which, according to Lenin's concept, was to ensure "irrespective of personalities" that no one's authority, be he the gensek or any other member of the Central Committee, could stand in the way of... unconditional access to information and ensure that everything was strictly aboveboard" (Vol 45, p 387).

To ensure that no one could stand in the way—but the TsKK stood in Stalin's way, and very much so. It was the most serious obstacle in the path of the establishment of unlimited personal power. So Stalin thought up a monitoring organ for the party which would not monitor him but be subordinate to the Central Committee, and thus to him himself as gensek.

Many violations of the Leninist norms of state and party life date back to the abolition of the TsKK.

What most concerns the party and nonparty masses at present is ensuring that restructuring becomes irreversible. People have not quite forgetten the brief "thaws" of the fifties and sixties. And they expect guarantees. Glasnost, democracy, and the people's activeness are such guarantees, of course. However, glasnost and democracy, restructuring and the activeness of the masses themselves need guarantees. In my view, new organizational structures are needed. Structures on the lines of the Law on the State Enterprise in the economy, for instance. To hope for a radical restructuring of the economy without such a law would be just as utopian as to expect manna from heaven.

But what kind of new organizational structure of party democracy will have to be invented in order to guarantee the irreversibility of the present revolutionary transformations? There is no need to invent anything. The organ which would guarantee this existed under Lenin and Leninism. It is the TsKK. It is as if Ilich had forseen our difficulties and troubles in their future concrete form. Not just Lenin's thoughts, even his words on this theme are most topical. Here they are: "...under such conditions, we have the best possible guarantee that has been conceived to date, a guarantee that the party will create a small central collegium which will be able to counter effectively all local influences and all other bureaucracy and establish a truly uniform application of the rule of law throughout the republic and throughout the whole federation" (Vol 45, p 200).

Some 15 years ago, in the presence of a learned man, I somehow expressed aloud my dreams about the restoration of the TsKK. To be honest, I wanted to talk to him about my dreams since he lectured on party building. But what he told me was not in the least what I had expected to hear:

"That is absolutely impossible. It would mean a dyarchy in the party...."

I then reminded him of Lenin's words uttered in a similar context in his article "How We Should Reorganize the Rabkrin [Workers' and Peasants' Inspectorate]": "I foresee one objection coming directly or indirectly from those circles which make our apparatus old.... The objection consists of the claim that the transformation I am proposing will lead to complete chaos. Members of the TsKK will tour various establishments..., introducing disorganization everywhere.... I believe that the malicious origin of this objection is so obvious that it does not even require an answer" (Vol 45, p 385).

Lenin's remark that the party represents the intelligence, the honor, and the conscience of our age is well known. In this aphoristic "psychological" portrait of the party, there is one interesting detail. It appears that Ilich attributed the most moral aspect of the party's qualities—its conscience—to the TsKK. In the Politburo draft resolution on the need to publish "a very detailed and solemn" statement in the press about the establishment of the Control Commission, he said outright that he deems it essential "to turn it into a true organ of party and proletarian conscience" (Vol 41, p 394).

Precisely an organ of conscience!

The hope V.I. Lenin was pinning on the TsKK was brilliantly simple. The most able and honest leaders of the party are not insured against falling prey to "purely personal or fortuitous circumstances." The existence of a "party and proletarian conscience" in the shape of the TsKK was to "provide the maximum safeguard" against possible mistakes and abuse of power.

With the abolition of the TsKK, Lenin's definition of the party was deprived of its last word which expresses the most moral of its qualities. The thought keeps coming back that precisely the abolition of the "party and proletarian conscience" led to the beginning of the personality cult, the unjustified repressions, and the numerous distortions of recent decades. Yet we, party members, asked each other sometimes when the moral need for this arises: "Do you have a party conscience, comrade?"

In short, I believe that what we need is the TsKK. I believe that it is necessary in the interests of the cause.

However, it cannot be revived without introducing the corresponding changes in the CPSU Statutes. Waiting for the next 28th CPSU Congress in... 1991 is a luxury we cannot afford! History has not allowed us time to drag our feet. In this situation I see only one solution, namely to discuss this important question.

I believe that since the TsKK from its very inception was the most democratic institution in the party, the revival of the TsKK would give a new content to our current slogan "Learn democracy!" The merger of the TsKK with the Rabkrin at the time improved the whole apparatus of Soviet state institutions and made it more democratic.

Ultimately, I do not claim to have a monopoly on truth. These are only my personal thoughts, and most probably they are debatable. But believe me, my letter is by no means dictated by a vain desire "to push myself into the limelight" but by my more than 40-year long experience as a party member who is not indifferent to the party's problems.

I. Sokolov, CPSU member since 1946, Novosibirsk.

Yevtushenko on High-Level Opposition to Glasnost
LD300018 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 29 Mar 88

[Interview with poet Yevgeniy Yevtushenko by unidentified correspondent; date and place not given]

[Text] Next on our program is an interview with the well-known Soviet poet Yevgeniy Yevtushenko. His poetry and prose have been translated into many languages and are read in many countries. The first question our correspondent asked him was: What's your attitude to glasnost and democratization in Soviet society? What difficulties do you see?

Glasnost means open competition between what is talented and progressive, and the mediocre diehards—what hampers our progress, says Yevgeniy Yevtushenko. This process began in our country after Stalin's death. Writers of my generation well remember that time when glasnost was won step by step and not only with victory, but with setbacks, great successes and painful defeats. Even today when glasnost is the principle of our restructuring, it is not universally supported. There are enough people, some of them in rather high positions often far beyond their capabilities, who oppose reform. They realize that those reforms will show them up, expose their inability to work for the good of society. But I believe that in spite of that hinderance we'll steadily develop and nurture genuine democracy in the interests of the people.

[Question] But what do we have to overcome on the way to such democracy?

We must overcome resistance in various forms, says Yevgeniy Yevtushenko. To begin with some people say that glasnost leads to anarchy. But I'd like to remind them that even right after the socialist revolution of 1917, when our country was under attack from foreign powers and torn by a civil war internally, Lenin was quite frank in talking about bureaucracy, bribes, black marketeers, and now that our country is much stronger we do not need to hush up our problems. I think that such hushing up is a form of stealthy anarchy. Another form of resisting glasnost is passivity in many parts of society, a sceptical attitude. This sour scepticism is as dangerous as feather-brained optimism. This is a destructive, not constructive, attitude. I am for glasnost which is expressed through actions, continues the poet. History has taught us serious lessons. They teach us that a disease turned inwards is mortally dangerous for society. This can still be applied to many of today's problems; those problems wouldn't be so acute now if in the past they hadn't been ignored. Take for example the food supply. The woes of our agriculture go back to the 1930's, to the extremes of forced collectivization in the years of the personality cult.

[Question] You have written many poems about that period of Soviet history. They sound confident that a personality cult will never be repeated, but it's no secret that to this day there are people who oppose bringing Stalin down from his pedestal and those people voice their opposition in the press. Some war veterans write that we owe a debt of gratitude to Stalin for defeating Hitler Germany; what would you say to those people?

Yes, there are many people who defend Stalin by saying that, after all we won the war thanks to him, said Yevgeniy Yevtushenko. Soldiers went into the attack crying for the motherland, for Stalin, and gave up their lives heroically. But we musn't forget that on the eve of the war Stalin ordered the arrest of many of the top commanders of the Red Army. Many talented scientists, designers, and industrial leaders fell victim to reprisals. I am convinced, says Yevgeniy Yevtushenko, that we must consider Stalin's period objectively and from many sides. On the 3rd July 1941 Stalin began his radio address to the people with the words: Citizens, brothers, and sisters. He moved many hearts that were still bleeding from the fresh wounds and offensives, that had been embittered by losses. However, after the war Stalin became absolutely indifferent to those brothers and sisters; they were something to trample upon. I think that we should put up memorials to the victims of Stalin's arbitrary reprisals all over the country. I talked about it in many parts of our country with workers and farmers, and they all agreed that it was needed.

Muscovites Polled on Meaning of 'Good Life'
LD271755 Moscow TASS in English 1732 GMT 27 Mar 88

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS—The question "What does it mean to live well" was put to 600 Muscovites in

a telephone public opinion poll, held by the Sociological Research Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, by the request of the newspaper ARGUMENTS AND FACTS.

Most of the respondents believe that the primary condition for "good life" is to have family wellbeing (29.5 percent of the respondents), to have interesting work (28.4), to be well off (27.2), to be healthy, to see relatives and friends healthy (23.8), to have peace on earth (15.6 percent).

There was an interesting connection between the "good life" judgements and the educational level of the respondents. Health is the priority to people with the elementary education (mainly citizens of the older generation), family problems are the primary concern of Muscovites with secondary and specialised education. "Good work" is the priority for people with higher education and candidates of sciences.

45.9 percent of those who believe that most important in life is "to be useful to society" are people with higher education.

Rehabilitated Leaders' Lives To Be Published

PM281010 Moscow TRUD in Russian 19 Mar 88 p 4

[Reply by N. Panfilov, senior editor at the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade, to reader's letter: ""National History""—first paragraph is reader's letter]

[Text] Where can one learn about the biographies of the party and state leaders who have now been rehabilitated? (I. Kumarin, Penza).

N. Panfilov, senior editor at the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing plants, and the Book Trade, replies.

The biographies of state, political, and military leaders will be included in the three-volume short encyclopedia of "National History" ["Otechestvennaya Istoriya"]. The first volume is due to be published next year and the last in 1992, for the 70th anniversary of the formation of the USSR.

Contents of KOMMUNIST No 5 Reported

PM290947 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 88 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Latest Issue of Journal"]

[Text] The fifth issue of the journal KOMMUNIST has been published. It opens with an editorial entitled "The Ideology of Revolutionary Thought and Action," which examines the fundamental ideological aspects of restructuring in the light of the tasks set by the CPSU Central Committee February (1988) Plenum.

Satisfying the population's demands for goods and services is a very important area of party social policy. In an article entitled "Priority Area of Social Policy" carried under the rubric "19th All-Union CPSU Conference" CPSU Central Committee Secretary A. Biryukova writes about how the task of supplying the market with consumer goods is being tackled. The same rubric also features documents from the the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism Central Party Archive entitled "Party Life," an essay by V. Kovalenko entitled "Mikhail Bachurin's Breakthrough," and contributions from a postal round-table discussion organized by the journal entitled "Democratizing the Party Means Democratizing Society."

The rubric "Acceleration and Restructuring: Theory and Practice" features an article by USSR MVD Minister A. Vlasov entitled "Safeguarding Law and Order" It describes the restructuring of MVD organs' activity, which is being conducted in an atmosphere of exacting daily party leadership by strengthening cadres centrally and locally through extensive democratization and glasnost while relying on the working people and labor collectives.

Difficult health care problems are examined in an essay by Ye. Temchin entitled "Who Will Assess Talent?"

The "Discussion and Debate" section is devoted to the economic theory and practice of restructuring.

The prospects and problems of economic cooperation are considered by FIAT Vice President Umberto Agnelli.

I. Zyazyun, rector of the Poltava Teaching Institute, writes an article entitled "A Teacher for All Times" marking the 100th anniversary of the birth of A.S. Makarenko.

A new rubric entitled "Man in History Is History in Man" features an article by S. Tyutyukin "Plekhanov: The Greatness of the Scholar, the Tragedy of the Revolutionary."

Travel notes by economist O. Latsis entitled "Along the Path of Reforms" contain observations about economic processes in the PRC.

The rubric "The Modern World: Trends and Contradictions" features an article by Academician G. Arbatov entitled "Faced with the Choice..." and certain documents of the 26th French Communist Party Congress.

Economic

Resolution Adopted on Retooling Light Industry

LD291832 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 29 Mar 88

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers have adopted a resolution on measures for the technical retooling of light industry in the period 1988-1995, which guarantee the expedited resolution of the problem of satisfying the commodity needs of the population.

The USSR Ministry of Light Industry, the councils of ministers of union and autonomous republics, the executive committees of local soviets, associations and enterprises, scientific research, design and planning organizations and model design centers have been set the task of making broad use of modern equipment, automated design and control systems, to achieve a substantial increase in the output of commodities and improve their quality and consumer properties. The resolution devotes particular attention to increasing output of footwear and ready-made, knitted and hosiery goods, for which consumption in 1995 will be secured at the level of rational norms, or approach them very closely.

Uralmash Rejection of 1988 Plan Examined

PM251215 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Mar 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Special correspondents M. Berger, A. Pashkov report: "The 'Uralmash' Affair"—first three paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] Sverdlovsk-Moscow—Nothing like this had ever happened before, the situation seemed quite impossible. The many-thousand-strong collective of one of the country's major enterprises—the "Uralmash" association—refused to accept the 1988 plan. A plan which had been handed down to it from the ministry, which, in turn, had received it from the Gosplan, which...

The point at issue was several percent of the total output plan. However, what for the "Uralmash" is a matter of 2-3 weeks, amounts to a whole year's work for many another a plant. The Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building was confronted with a seemingly insoluble problem: Where was it to place the extra millions? Meanwhile, the "Uralmash" labor collective council had other problems. Is it correct to plan output which the customers refuse to accept? Is it possible to produce equipment for which not all subassemblies are available, nor will they be? Is it possible to fulfill an order without having the necessary equipment? And a mass of other similar problems with which most enterprises are familiar.

"An unrealistic plan came into conflict with economic accountability [khozraschet] and exposed all the shortcomings of previous arbitrary planning. The collective realized this and decided to radically change the situation,"—this is what A. Korolev, chairman of the "Uralmash" labor collective council and CPSU Central Committee member, wrote on the subject in IZVESTIYA in the second half of January (No 23).

The unconcealed, even demonstrative unwillingness with which the Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building agreed to receive us, the strained way in which the conversation was conducted, and what was actually said—all reflected one wish: The affair with the "Uralmash" should be committed to oblivion, and it must most certainly not be discussed in the press. Our interlocutors took the view that this might cause chaos not just in the sector but the whole national economy.

R. Arutyunov, first deputy minister, asked straight, without beating around the bush:

What do we have to do to prevent the publication of your article in the newspaper?

Why do the people in the ministry view the "Uralmash" case not merely as an unpleasant surprise but as a socially dangerous phenomenon?

Well, you see, A. Sukhanov said several times emphatically, we will not be able to get next year's plan together. After what has happened, no enterprise will agree to our target. What will happen then?

This was the deputy chief of the Main Economic Administration speaking, and the very way the question was put contained a warning: Just wait and see what this independence and the freedoms connected with economic accountability will bring you.

Asking many people in various offices dozens of questions, we were essentially trying to find out one thing: Is it possible for an enterprise to independently draw up and approve annual plans as stated in Article 10 of the Law on the State Enterprise? Is it possible for a labor collective in a dispute with an administrative-executive power to rely on arguments provided by legislative power?

We believe that the new law struck it lucky with the "Uralmash". Why? Judge for yourself. In the Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building alone, 17 enterprises submitted their draft plans for 1988 which were altogether several hundred million rubles below the control figures handed down to them by the ministry. What happened to their plans, were they approved in accordance with the Law [on the State Enterprise]? These plans do not exist since the enterprises, despite everything, approved the volumes originally set by the ministry.

The aforementioned January IZVESTIYA article reported also that a final decision was to be adopted 23 January. We expected a positive or negative decision to be made immediately, especially since a group of experts from USSR Council of Ministers Bureau on Machine Building had already visited Sverdlovsk and had made a comprehensive analysis of the situation on the spot. However, the situation was not clarified, neither the day after the article had been published nor during the following month. Whenever we asked as to what we should tell our readers, we always received the same answer: "The matter is being attended to."

Resolving the question proved rather difficult. The "Uralmash" looms too large in the national economy. Probably it is also regarded as quite an important fact that major party officials, members of the government, and even its chairman have started out here.

This is why we repeat, the law struck it lucky at the "Uralmash," although for a long time the situation remained unclear. Meanwhile, a seditious question has occurred to us: Is the investigation under way at the ministry and the Gosplan in respect of the "Uralmash" production volumes at all legal? After all, the Law on the State Enterprise makes no mention in either of the six points of the article on planning that an independently drawn up plan, be it an annual or a 5-year plan, approved by the collective, needs to be agreed on or approved by anyone else. Control figures, state orders, long-term economic norms and limits, direct orders from consumers and supply organs—all this is mentioned in the law. But there is no mention of the need for a plan approved by the collective to be approved by anyone else. There is no provision for this.

So what is at issue here? This is not an easy question to answer.

But there is plenty of food for thought. Thought about a mentality which is based on an almost superstitious centralism. We normally assume that everything that is being done or planned to be done at local level must, without fail, be agreed at the center. We cannot imagine anything else! The "Uralmash" workers did not doubt for a minute the need to agree their right to differ both at the ministry and in the Gosplan. The latter did not doubt for a minute that they had the last word. True, there is nothing about this in the law, but after all, this is how it has always been done. How it always will be?

In the ministry they painted a truly apocalyptic picture of enterprises' mass refusal to submit to the instructions from the center. Can you imagine, they told us, what will happen if every enterprise sets itself a plan which is below the control figures?

What can you say to this? First, not all labor collectives are pulling downward, there are plenty of examples which go the other way and our newspaper, among others, has reported them. Second, we will cite the opinion of Academician L. Abalkin, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Institute. The fact that enterprises, approving their own plan, may set themselves smaller output volumes than envisaged by the control figures should be viewed calmly, he believes. The idea that enterprises are after an easy life is based on the old ideology that at the center there are wise people who have the interests of the state at heart, while at grass roots level there are enterprise managers and collectives seeking to grab as much as possible from the state. Meanwhile, the labor collectives are no less concerned about the general welfare than the center...

It is alright for academicians to deliberate, the ministry may say. But we are responsible for the volume and range of goods produced and no one has lifted this responsibility from us.

Here is the USSR Gosplan resolution on the compilation of the plan for 1988 and we are implementing it, R. Arutyunov told us.

Here is the Law on the State Enterprise which the "Uralmash" is implementing, we replied. What has a greater force—a law or an ordinance?

The ministry apparatus is not an enterprise, Yu.Shleyfer, deputy chief of production administration, who was taking part in the discussion, said. Therefore the law does not apply to us. Unlike the "Uralmash," we cannot set ourselves a plan, submit it to the Gosplan, and consider our job done.

The ministry's stance is up to a point, if not acceptable, then at least understandable. It is true that, like in the past, it is expected to "safeguard the plan" and it is doing everything that depends on it to ensure this. It is doing it by tried and tested methods—orders and threats of punishment. Where does that leave the economy?

They are cursing the "Uralmash." Wise guys, they are saying, they have worked it all out in advance! Reducing the output volume will be cheaper for them than underfulfilling the ministry plan. What do the "Uralmash" people say to this?

We have fed the realities of our existence into the computer, A. Osintsev, deputy director general for economic affairs, relates, and we obtained the total of the envisaged underfulfillment of the ministry's control figures. We have no reason to doubt the machine. It has calculated our last year's shortfall with an accuracy of 0.5 percent. It is true that by decreasing our output volume we lose part of our profit. However, even taking this into account, the material incentives fund will total R13 million. If we accept the plan proposed by the ministry and fail to fulfill it (and no one has any doubts about this), the fund will total only R8.7 million. In the past too, the plan was too high as a rule. But it was glossed over one way or another. Now, in the conditions of economic accountability, it cannot be "glossed over."

We are fed up with the holes in the plan...

This is what it has come to! R. Arutyunov said indignantly. One director told me: "I will not do this work." Is is not advantageous enough for him, you see! But who will ensure deliveries to cooperatives?

Strange logic: We are talking about a switch to economic methods of management yet we are indignant when an enterprise refuses to do disadvantageous work. If one

wants to be indignant about something then it should be the fact that it is more advantageous for an enterprise to do less. What kind of economic levers are these?

It is wrong to get irritated at the "Uralmash" "maneuvers." It is necessary to study their nature and draw the right conclusions. Provided, of course, that we seriously want the efforts of labor collectives to be geared to state interests through economic advantage for the enterprises themselves rather than vice versa.

The ministry is angry with the "Uralmash," treating it as if it were a willful child. The association, they are saying, has always enjoyed the most favored status, so much has been done for it, so much has been invested in it, and in return... Contract commitments are not being fulfilled, the growth rate is lower than the average for the sector as a whole, and in general they have been marking time.

There is a mass of claims against the "Uralmash." It must be admitted that most of them are justified. But it must be added that it was not "Uralmash" itself that has landed itself in this situation. It was actively "assisted." The file in the Sverdlovsk IZVESTIYA correspondent's office contains pronouncements by the association's leaders who have worked here over the past 10-15 years.

For years they have spoken and written about the unchecked expansion of the range of goods produced at the "Uralmash," they have defended the idea of start-to-finish centralized planning embracing all the stages of updating of capital assets and technological processes from scientific research to plant production units. Special concern has been caused by the absence of efficient, balanced planning of the production of individual equipment.

So what has changed today? Alas, the negative trends not only persist, they are being reinforced.

Let us take a brief look at history. Back in May 1926 the Presidium of the Uraloblispolkom discussed the report of the Uralsovnarkhoz [National Economic Council] planning bureau which said: "The heavy machine building plant must meet the needs for machine building goods of the Urals and Siberian industry and be as flexible as possible, that is, it must have all the prerequisites to ensure the intensive development of any given sector of industry."

Well, and in practice, is the "Uralmash" able today, 60 years later, "to ensure intensive development" as was envisaged when it was founded?

"The association's experimental base does not meet the demands for the creation of modern equipment. Government decisions on the development of the base, adopted earlier, are not being fulfilled. Up-to-date subassemblies, supplied by enterprises under the jurisdiction of other ministries, for certain types of equipment are not available." This is the conclusion reached by experts of the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for Machine Building. A conference held 3 February in the office of I.S. Silayev, chairman of the Bureau and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, examined the question of the work of "Uralmash" (and three other Sverdlovsk associations) and instructed the USSR Gosplan to introduce changes in the economic indicators of the Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building and the "Uralmash."

During the whole time we were following the development of events we were constantly being referred to the USSR Gosplan. The Council of Ministers Bureau for Machine Building, the ministry, and even the "Uralmash" people themselves were constantly telling us: The solution of the question lies with the Gosplan, contact them.

Journalists are well aware that it is extremely difficult to question any official of that respected institution. If anyone tells you: "Ask the Gosplan," it is as if he were say "God knows the answer to this question."

It is true that last year the Gosplan began to hold news conferences. The invited journalists were told that the atmosphere of democratization and glasnost was also changing the style of this authoritative organ. The news conferences, they told us then, will be held regularly from now on to ensure that the public knows on what the country's main economic agency is working.

At that memorable first news conference we, among others, asked S. Sitaryan, first deputy chairman of the USSR Gosplan: Which of the Gosplan's major decisions of recent years did he, personally, regard as erroneous? Stepan Aramaisovich said that he was not prepared to answer this question.

In some respects we found an answer to this question in the November (1987) issue of the journal EKO which published an interesting retrospective study of the quality of 5-year plans carried out by Doctor of Economic Sciences B. Orlov. The author reaches the conclusion that the concepts on which the elaboration of many plans was based were not sufficiently well-founded and that the drafts were unrealistic, and cites a host of other utterly uncomplimentary findings. But the most amazing thing is that the researcher was unable to discover any attempt at an objective cause-and-effect analysis of the fulfillment (or nonfulfillment) of medium-term plans. The Gosplan, he concludes, is so overburdened with day-to-day affairs that it has shown no interest in such an analysis.

Why did we ask about mistakes then, only to remember them now. Because, in one way or another, these mistakes, scaled down to the size of individual enterprises are reflected in the work of these enterprises, including the "Uralmash."

Our maximum program was to visit Gosplan offices together with "Uralmash" representatives who had been frequent visitors there over the past few weeks. We wanted to hear the sides' arguments, to better understand their positions.

We telephoned V. Romanov, deputy chief of a subsection of the combined machine building section on the eve of his appointment with the "Uralmash" representatives. He said he was not opposed to our presence, but it had to be sanctioned by the leadership of the section. We telephoned V. Azarov, chief of the section.

The question has not been resolved, he said.

We want to see what is being done to find a solution.

That, it turned out, was not possible.

Perhaps you would like, in the meantime, to comment on the situation and tell us your attitude to it?

No.

And after a solution has been found?

We have a rule: All contacts with the press are possible only with the permission of the Gosplan deputy chairman.

An amazing situation: We can gain access to the Council of Ministers, the CPSU Central Committee, and the Supreme Soviet without any difficulties and talk about any question that interests the newspaper. However, to gain access to the Gosplan is a problem. A specially appointed deputy chairman decides what questions should be answered and by whom.

After considerable efforts we finally obtained passes to the Gosplan, valid for one occasion only. When, after talking to V. Romanov and Ye. Fadeyev from the combined machine building department, we tried to clarify the position of one other involved subdivision, the balances section, S. Akatnov, the section's chief, curtly told us over the telephone that he was not one of the people who had been instructed to answer IZVESTIYA's questions.

So what did we find out?

In the Gosplan, too, they are angry with the "Uralmash."

Well, wouldn't you be, V. Romanov exclaimed. In July every last detail had been finalized, everything had been neatly stacked (a good term to use for a planner—authors' remark), and suddenly they rebel!

But after all, part of the equipment which they have been told to produce is not required by the clients. This is why they are asking that it be taken out of the plan.

Prior to our meeting in the Gosplan, we contacted a number of managers of enterprises which have cancelled "Uralmash" deliveries for 1988. The director of the Dokuchayevskiy dolomite flux combine said that the equipment had been ordered back at the beginning of last year, assuming that the ministry would pay for everything. However, in the fall, having looked at our finances, we realized that we had ordered R2 million-worth more than we could afford. So at a meeting of the labor collective council we decided not to conclude a contract for the delivery of two "Uralmash" excavators.

The director of another enterprise, the Karatau chemical combine, has asked to carry over the delivery of an agglomeration machine, costing around R4 million, to 1990—there are delays with the construction of the second stage of the combine. So why incur fines?

It all seems understandable and logical. Economic accountability is making enterprises revise their production programs and orders for equipment and to establish direct contacts. The law allows and encourages this. Yet in the Gosplan they are trying to convince us that this should not be done because everything has been added up and balanced both regarding the 5-year and the annual plan. But what kind of balancing is this if the "Uralmash" alone has received cancellations totaling R30 million from its clients?

This is no problem, V. Romanov assures us, the ministry can deliberately agree to pay the fines for uninstalled equipment. On the other hand this means that its enterprises will have the equipment guaranteed when the construction work is completed.

It seemed that our interlocutor was not at all worried by the fact that the living labor of hundreds and thousands of people who put a great effort into meeting their contract obligations would lie barren for years. Is this likely to add enthusiasm to their work?

Incidentally, it is not just a matter of enthusiasm. By 1 January of the current year R12 billion worth of uninstalled equipment had amassed in the warehouses at capital construction projects in the five main complexes—the fuel and energy, metallurgical, chemical and timber, machine building, and agro-industrial complex. When everything is in the hands of a middleman invested with administrative power, both sides can lose out. The law is orientating enterprises toward direct ties and envisages wholesale trade in the means of production. All this is supposed to deliver labor collectives from "rush" and unnecessary work.

So we asked outright: Is the Law on the Enterprise functioning or is it not?

It is not fully operational, V. Romanov replied. We still live under the 5-year plan. But as from the new 5-year plan..."

At a recent session of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo it was emphasized that the objectives of the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum aimed at enhancing the role of enterprises in planning and the subordination of their activity to consumers' requirements have largely not been implemented. This is due not only to the specific features of the period of transition toward an integrated system of management but also to outright omissions in the organization of the work at the center and at local level.

Here is an interesting detail. In the heat of the long and difficult investigations in Moscow offices everyone had forgotten about the "culprits of the whole affair," about the "Uralmash" labor collective council. No one even dreamed of inviting worker A. Korolev, its chairman and CPSU Central Committee member, to take part in the discussions at any stage. This, in our view, once again reflects the administrative-technocratic approach to the management of the economy.

How was the main question resolved? In early March, after agreement with the Gosplan, two deputy ministers signed a protocol on switching the millions which the "Uralmash" "refused" to the Ministry of the Automotive Industry. Victory?

It was a disgrace! R. Arutyunov exclaimed indignantly. The Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building was standing there like a pauper at the church door begging that someone would take its spare volumes. But the main thing is, if you are going to write about this, do not write that the collective has won, the first deputy minister repeated four or five times in the course of our conversation, it is a Pyrrhic victory.

We have no intention of considering the adopted decision a victory for the collective. What happened with "Uralmash," and the way the dispute ended is above all a victory for the Law on the Enterprise. That is the main thing.

Gosbank Working Group Studies Currency Problems

PM251433 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 12, Mar 88 (Signed to Press 17 Mar 88) p 21

["Reply to EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA" by O. Mozhayskov, deputy chief of the USSR Gosbank Economic Currency Administration: "In Reply to the Article 'Reconstruction of Ideas' (Issue No 1)"]

[Text] Under the new conditions of economic management, exporter enterprises and foreign trade associations and firms will have to run various types of risks which were previously fully covered by the state. They include: The chance of nonpayment by corresponding agents abroad; the risk of our exporter's foreign currency earnings being frozen in bank accounts in the importer's country as a result of the introduction of restrictions on foreign currency withdrawals; the risk of the ruble equivalent of export earnings declining as a result of changes in exchange rates; and others. The article correctly notes that the clearing method of payments in foreign trade is not always in the exporters' interests.

At present the departments providing foreign currency credit facilities for the USSR's foreign economic ties perceive their task as being to neutralize the negative aspects of the existing mechanism for foreign payments. A number of necessary measures are being elaborated for this purpose.

The most effective means for solving the problem would be the introduction of convertibility for the Soviet ruble, which would facilitate foreign payments by Soviet enterprises. But prerequisites for convertibility are not yet in existence, and their creation would demand a certain period of time. Furthermore, the immediate task is to introduce convertibility for the ruble in the currencies of CEMA countries. This means that the shortcomings in the existing payments mechanism will not be fully eliminated. The greatest concern is caused by the state of payments with developing countries, many of which experience payment difficulties.

The USSR Gosbank, jointly with the interested departments, has set up a working group to work out various aspects of the creation of a specialized company to engage in international commodity exchange operations. Their essence is that the exporter accepts as payment any commodities which either meet the needs of the national economy (and not just his own) or are suitable for reexport to other countries in exchange for freely convertible currency. The commodity exchange company could also assist the export of machinery and technical products and the growth of foreign currency receipts in freely convertible currencies. Its activity would thus organically combine the interests of individual Soviet exporters and of the state as a whole.

The banking system will have an important role to play in stimulating exports. Questions of creating a system of long-term credits for exports and of insuring the export credits and foreign currency risks run by exporter enterprises are being studied at present. The implementation of these measures will create favorable conditions for the development of Soviet exports of machinery and technical products.

Agricultural

Murakhovskiy: Farmers 'Congress of Restructuring'

PM281334 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 26 Mar 88 pp 2-3

[Speech delivered by V.S. Murakhovskiy, USSR Council of Ministers first deputy chairman and USSR Gosagroprom chairman, at the 24 March session of the Fourth All-Union Congress of Collective Farmers in the Kremlin]

[Text] Esteemed comrades! The Fourth All-Union Congress of Collective Farmers is taking place at a crucial period, when our country has entered the decisive stage

of the restructuring that now covers all spheres of social life and has roused all strata of the population. The profoundly meaningful speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, offered a further theoretical development of Leninist ideas on the cooperative system and convincingly demonstrated its growing role in the development of socialism.

The discussion of the draft Law on the Cooperative System and the draft kolkhoz Model Charter at the congress is noteworthy. It is an integral part of restructuring, that mighty movement that has been launched in our country for the revival of the Leninist face of socialism, the development of people's power, and the establishment of a Leninist style of leadership of economic development.

The present congress will go down in the history of kolkhoz development as the congress of restructuring. There is no doubt that it will give new impetus to the development of the agricultural cooperative system on the basis of the development of self-management and the establishment of the system's economic autonomy.

Our country's kolkhozes have traveled a difficult path. Whatever shape their historical destiny takes, they have always demonstrated their vitality and their socialist nature. Collectivization marked a radical change in the whole tenor of the peasantry's life on socialist principles.

At the same time it is well known that the strict regulation of kolkhozes' activity retarded their development. This was well said in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech at the congress. Of course, it fettered the kolkhozes' initiative and cut the peasants off from the land.

Looking back at the past, we see that considerable damage was done to the economy and the social development of the countryside by the unjustified amalgamation and subdivision of kolkhozes, their reorganization into sovkhozes, the elimination of small, so-called "villages without a future," restrictions on personal subsidiary farming, and bans and restrictions on the creation of undertakings of various kinds.

The decisions of the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and the program for the revolutionary renewal of our society put forward by the 27th party congress radically changed the socioeconomic situation in the countryside. Restructuring in the agro-industrial complex means not only overcoming the stagnation phenomena and conservatism of the preceding period, but also eliminating the obsolete forms of organization of production that held back the development of kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

The agro-industrial complex is now managed and planned as an integrated national economic system. Favorable conditions are emerging for the development of economic links and integration links between kolkhozes and sovkhozes on the one hand and processing and service enterprises on the other within the agro-industrial complex at rayon, oblast, and republic levels. Efforts are being made to improve and adjust these links. This is a complex process. Where people have managed to link the interests of farms and enterprises into a single unit, good results are being achieved.

The transforming force of restructuring is already yielding its first results. In the first 2 years of the 5-year plan the production of grain, sugar beet, oil crops, meat, milk, and other products increased. The volume of gross agricultural output increased by 9 percent over that period. The entire increase was secured through increased labor productivity. The economy of kolkhozes and sovkhozes has strengthened. Last year agriculture obtained R28.4 billion in profit.

It should be acknowledged, however, that the necessary acceleration in the development of the agro-industrial complex has yet to be achieved. You can all see clearly that the requirements of the population in many cities are far from fully satisfied.

Our agricultural production is certainly not at a standstill. It is growing, but it is growing only slowly, and the production potential is not yielding the necessary return. There are many shortcomings in the utilization of irrigated land on Uzbekistan's kolkhozes, livestock raising productivity is low on the farms of the Kazakh SSR and Western and Eastern Siberia, and there is no stability in grain production in regions of the Volga. To better understand the current situation in the country's agriculture, it is necessary to assess how far its general level accords with the potential available and with society's requirements and to compare the average level with the leading farms' indicators.

Take, for instance, the Ukraine—the country's age-old granary. The average yield of grain crops in the last three 5-year plans here totaled 25-26 quintals per hectare. Surely the Ukrainian grain growers have exhausted their potential? No. Last year 2,050 kolkhozes and sovkhozes gathered 40 or more quintals of grain per hectare. If all the farms reached that level, the republic could not only supply itself fully with grain, but could also add substantially to unionwide stocks.

There are low corn yields on Moldavian farms, although they raise this crop by intensive techniques.

We often mention the farms of the Baltic republics, which have higher indicators for livestock raising productivity than the countrywide average. But to be fair, it should be noted that they too do not utilize by any means all their potential.

What is holding the kolkhozes back from increasing the production of output, what does the peasant lack today? Very often he lacks the sense of proprietorship, the sense

of responsibility for the end result. Many kolkhoz leaders and specialists are slow to assimilate the principles of economic accountability, they display inertia and commit gross violations of technical procedures. The great potential of intensive techniques is not exploited. The achievements of science, technology, and leading experience are poorly utilized.

The restructuring of the economic mechanism in the agro-industrial complex is aimed specifically at reviving the kolkhoz member's economic grip and spirit of enterprise.

It is quite clear that it is only possible to advance agriculture and increase production efficiency by focusing attention on pulling up the laggard kolkhozes and sovkhozes, developing wide initiative and self-management among labor collectives, and adopting the collective, family, and rental contract and the system of remuneration from gross income, whereby social and personal interests are combined in the best way. The intensive labor collectives are an example of this. In Siberia, the North Caucasus, and the Ukraine, in such collectives one worker produces output worth R80-100 or more. Such experience also exists already on the farms of the non-Chernozem Zone. It is our priority task to utilize it and to extend it everywhere on the kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

The full assimilation of intensive techniques and a breakthrough in labor productivity can be achieved only on the basis of modern technical resources. The report and the speeches rightly criticized the poor reliability and quality and low productivity of many agricultural machines. It must be acknowledged that the USSR Gosagroprom has not succeeded in breaking through the machine builders' departmental interests. In the near future we must, in conjunction with them, gain a profound understanding of matters of the pricing of machinery and ensure the production of machines whose technical level is up to world standards.

The agro-industrial complex has now entered a crucial stage of restructuring. The transition to full economic accountability and self-financing demands a thoughtful approach to the utilization of economic levers and incentives, especially prices and differentiated supplements. A study of the state of affairs in the localities shows that certain farm leaders do not use this major state assistance to increase production and increase their income on this basis.

Agro-industrial committees and rayon agro-industrial association councils must bring prices and supplements skillfully into play to eradicate thriftlessness, parasitism, and wage leveling and ensure a rapid increase in the volume of production and improvement in its efficiency. Much remains to be done by the Gosagroprom together with central economic departments to create in the new conditions, on the basis of prices and a flexible taxation policy, equal economic conditions for farms working under different natural conditions, taking into account the evaluation of the land and the existence of manpower resources.

Delegates have noted in their speeches that the futile practice of imposing dubious recommendations on farms persists and petty tutelage over leaders and specialists still occurs. This criticism is justified. Why does it happen?

In recent years a sound legal basis has been created for the autonomy of kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Central Committee and government resolutions give you the right to show initiative and autonomy in increasing production and improving its efficiency. But that right must be used, and used resolutely. You will have the full support of the Gosagroprom for this.

Shortcomings in the utilization of economic methods, the administrative decree style of management by rayon agro-industrial associations, which, unfortunately, has taken root in many of them, and the need for integration processes are calling new organizational forms into being.

Prestige and recognition has already been won by the science-and-production systems for corn set up on the basis of the All-Union Corn Institute in Dnepropetrovsk as well as the zonal institute in Kurgan Oblast, the "Rape" system headed by the Lipetsk Institute, the "Buckwheat" production system led by the "Iskra" Kolkhoz in Ternopol Oblast, the Science-and-Production Association for Pork Production in Vitebsk Oblast, and others. Experience shows that such systems make it possible rapidly to introduce the achievements of scientific and technical progress, increase production, and improve all economic indicators. For us, it is important for science-and-production and production systems to take in the majority of kolkhozes and sovkhozes, especially the laggards, as early as this year. We believe leading farms, following the example of Ternopol Oblast's "Iskra" Kolkhoz and others, could assume this responsibility.

The agro-industrial complex has much to do to improve the storage and processing of agricultural produce. It is well known that the elimination of losses will make it possible to increase resources for consumption by 20-30 percent and save significant resources. The situation is changing radically in this respect with the creation of agro-industrial combines, agro-industrial firms, and agro-industrial associations of the cooperative type. Here rational integration is sought, which virtually eliminates losses of produce between production, processing, and sale. Much can also be done by the kolkhozes by developing their own production facilities for the processing of produce. Delegates have said that there is at present a shortage of such equipment. That is true. The party Central Committee and government have adopted major measures to increase the output of equipment,

refrigerators, and means of mechanization of warehouse operations. A powerful sector for the production of fully prefabricated storehouses is being created. Machine building ministries and the defense sectors of industry are involved in the implementation of this program.

The speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, at the present congress stressed with particular force that for workers in the agro-industrial complex and kolkhoz members there is no more crucial task than to ensure the reliable supply of food to our country's population. In light of these demands it is necessary to increase grain production this year, and to bring the gross grain harvest to 250 million tonnes by 1990. With existing grain sowings, each farm must increase the yield by at least 4-5 quintals per hectare by the end of the 5-year plan. This task is complex, but realistic.

Kolkhozes and sovkhozes must significantly increase the production of sugar and vegetable oil, supply the population of cities and industrial centers with potatoes and vegetables, and extend sales of fruit and berries.

In livestock raising, the rate of increase in milk and meat production should at least be doubled.

The population's personal plots, collective orchard and vegetable growing, and subsidiary farms of industrial enterprises could make a considerable contribution to supplementing food resources. Kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and agro-industrial organs should devote constant attention and assistance to their development.

The new situation taking shape in the countryside makes it possible to accelerate the resolution of social questions. The kolkhozes' economy is strengthening and rural dwellers' incomes are growing. Housing construction has been stepped up. But this is only a beginning.

We should all be ashamed that in a number of places concern for people has been pushed into the background and poor use is made of the opportunities for developing individual and cooperative housing construction. There are still not enough hospitals, clinics, children's preschool institutions, and trade and consumer service enterprises being commissioned in the countryside. I would like to stress once again that particular attention must be devoted to the development of individual housing construction.

People building houses for themselves are granted credit to the tune of R20,000 over a 50-year period, construction materials, and house components through the consumer cooperative system.

In a word, everything possible is being done to give the rural dweller a good homestead. To improve services to rural dwellers, it is necessary to bring all forms of cooperative work fully into play and to encourage the provision of services on the basis of the principles of individual labor activity.

Comrades! We are all agreed that success is ultimately ensured by cadres and by the standard of organizational work. The kolkhoz system has raised remarkable workers, true masters of their trade, talented organizers of the Soviet peasantry. Many of them are present at the congress today.

The experience of frontrunners and acknowledged leaders in crop farming and livestock raising should become the property of every farm in the country. The study of this experience must form the basis of a continuous system of training and retraining of cadres. Schools of leading experience should operate on every farm and in every rayon, oblast, and kray. Matters must be organized in such a way that training becomes an integral part of the production process. Obviously we at the USSR Gosagroprom, together with the Union Kolkhoz Council, should think about setting up an all-union school of organizers of kolkhoz production, where kolkhoz chairmen could be trained and retrained.

Comrades! The draft Law on the Cooperative System and Model Charter submitted for dicsussion at the congress of kolkhoz members reflect substantial changes in the socioeconomic and legal position of kolkhozes. These documents basically accord with the radical changes taking place in our society's life.

We are witnessing and participating in a revival of Leninist ideas on the cooperative system at the present stage. Their implementation will give new strength to the kolkhoz system and make it possible to achieve major successes in the implementation of the party's agrarian policy. (applause)

Military

Shcherbitskiy, Others Discuss Military Training

PM300859 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Mar 88 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Training Reliable Defenders of the Motherland"]

[Text] Kiev, 28 Mar—Questions pertaining to the training of young men for military service were discussed today at an enlarged session of the Kiev Red Banner Military District Military Council. Senior officials from the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers, and the Ukrainian Komsomol Central Committee, secretaries of a number

of party obkoms, oblispolkom deputy chairmen, and leaders of republic ministries and departments, the Ukrainian SSR DOSAAF, and military commissariats participated.

It was noted at the session that the young people joining the troops today are, generally, well prepared. This is the result of considerable work by party, soviet, and Komsomol organizations, workers at public and vocational and technical educational organs, health care organs, military commissariats, and DOSAAF committees.

At the same time restructuring has not yet really impinged on work with young people of predraft and draft age. The quality and effectiveness of this work should be considerably higher. Particular attention should be devoted to elucidating the tasks set by the party at the present stage and to shaping in young people a correct understanding of the historic path traveled by Soviet society and a readiness to augment the revolutionary, combat, and labor traditions of the party and people.

It is necessary to link military-patriotic work more closely with the fostering in young men of a sense of internationalism, class solidarity, and friendship among our country's peoples. It is also important to strengthen military units' patronage ties with labor collectives, educational establishments, and DOSAAF schools. Young men's physical training and health work with people of predraft age must be further improved.

The session was addressed by V.V. Shcherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary.

'Many Unresolved Problems'

PM300839 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Mar 88 First Edition p 1

[Correspondent Colonel A. Polyakov report: "To Better Prepare Future Servicemen"]

[Text] An enlarged session of the Kiev Military District Military Council was attended by Ukrainian Communist Party obkom secretaries and representatives of the republic's soviet organs, military commissariats, ministries, and departments. The question of the rising generation's patriotic and internationalist education and the state of initial military training and the preparation of youths for service in the Soviet Army was discussed.

Colonel General V. Osipov, district commander; Lieutenant General V. Sharygin, Military Council member and District Political Directorate chief; V. Tsybukh, Ukrainian Komsomol Central Committee first secretary; A. Romanenko, Ukrainian minister of health; Major General B. Kharchuk, chairman of the republic DOSAAF Central Committee; and other comrades emphasized in their speeches that there are many unresolved problems in this work.

Young people enter the Army who lack clear ideological convictions, who are given to using liquor and drugs, and who neither work nor study. Atheist, antialcohol, and legal propaganda is poorly organized among young people. Little attention is devoted to the physical training of future servicemen, assessments are overstated when they try to achieve GTO [Ready for Labor and Defense of the USSR] norms, and construction of military sports camps is being held up.

It was emphasized that the preparation of youths for service in the Soviet Army must be considered a very important task of party, Komsomol, and trade union organizations which must be resolved purposefully and systematically and that it is necessary to get through to everyone.

V. Shcherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, addressed the Military Council session.

Yazov Order on Reserves, April-June Draft

PM291403 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Mar 88 Second Edition p 1

[USSR Defense Minister Order of the Day No 119, dated Moscow, 29 March 1988 "On the Discharge From the Ranks of the USSR Armed Forces Into the Reserve of Servicemen Who Have Completed Their Prescribed Period of Active Military Service and on the Next Draft of Citizens for Active Military Service in April-June 1988"—boldface as published]

[Text] In accordance with the USSR Law "On Compulsory Military Service" **I order**:

1. That draftees who have completed their prescribed period of active military service be discharged from the ranks of the Soviet Army, Navy, Border Guards, and Internal Troops into the reserve in April-June 1988.

2. That, in connection with the discharge into the reserve of the servicemen referred to in Paragraph 1 of this order, male citizens aged 18 by the draft date and without the right to draft deferment and citizens above draft age whose draft deferment has expired be drafted for active military service in the Soviet Army, Navy, Border Guards, and Internal Troops in April-June 1988.

3. That this order be read out in all companies, batteries, and squadrons, and aboard ships.

Army General D. Yazov, USSR defense minister